arXiv:0711.2965v2 [math.QA] 20 Dec 2007

Deformation Quantization of Surjective Submersions and Principal Fibre Bundles

Martin Bordemann[*]
Laboratoire de Mathématiques
Université de Haute-Alsace Mulhouse
4, Rue des Frères Lumière
F.68093 Mulhouse
France

and

Nikolai Neumaier[‡], **Stefan Waldmann**[§], **Stefan Weiss**[¶]
Fakultät für Mathematik und Physik
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg
Physikalisches Institut
Hermann Herder Straße 3
D 79104 Freiburg
Germany

November 2007

To the memory of Julius Wess

Abstract

In this paper we establish a notion of deformation quantization of a surjective submersion which is specialized further to the case of a principal fibre bundle: the functions on the total space are deformed into a right module for the star product algebra of the functions on the base manifold. In case of a principal fibre bundle we require in addition invariance under the principal action. We prove existence and uniqueness of such deformations. The commutant within all differential operators on the total space is computed and gives a deformation of the algebra of vertical differential operators. Applications to noncommutative gauge field theories and phase space reduction of star products are discussed.

---

[*] Martin.Bordemann@uha.fr
[‡] Nikolai.Neumaier@physik.uni-freiburg.de
[§] Stefan.Waldmann@physik.uni-freiburg.de
[¶] Stefan.Weiss@physik.uni-freiburg.de

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Algebraic Preliminaries **6**

3 The topological bar and Koszul complex of $C^\infty(V)$ **11**

4 Deformation Quantization of Surjective Submersions **16**

5 Deformation Quantization of Principal Bundles **24**

6 Associated Vector Bundles **28**

1 Introduction

Principal fibre bundles and surjective submersions are omnipresent in differential geometry. To name just a few instances: any vector bundle is an associated bundle to its frame bundle, proper and free Lie group actions are principal fibre bundles, and physical gauge theories are formulated using principal fibre bundles as starting point. The projection map from the total space of the principal bundle to the base space is an example of a surjective submersion. Among many others, an interesting example of a surjective submersion in phase space reduction in geometrical mechanics is the projection map from the momentum level surface in a Poisson manifold onto the reduced phase space whenever one is in the regular situation.

On the other hand, deformation quantization [2] has reached great popularity in various applications in mathematical physics, not only involving the original intention of understanding the quantum theory of a classical mechanical system with phase space modelled by a Poisson manifold. Even though this original motivation is still one of the major issues in deformation quantization, more recent applications involve the so-called noncommutative space-times, see e.g. [24] . Here the space-time manifold is endowed with a noncommutative deformation, the star product, which is seen as an effective theory of some still unknown quantum gravity. Then on such a noncommutative space-time (quantum) field theories are established and studied intensely. Of particular interest are of course again the gauge theories.

Having these applications in mind it is natural to ask how one can define and construct deformation quantizations of principal bundles and, more generally, of surjective submersions.

In the following we will exclusively work with *formal* deformation quantization: recall that a formal star product $\star$ on a manifold M is an associative $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$-bilinear product for the formal power series $C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]$ in λ with values in the smooth complex-valued functions $C^\infty(M)$ such that

$$f \star g = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r C_r(f,g), \tag{1.1}$$

$C_0(f,g) = fg$ is the pointwise product and $1 \star f = f = f \star 1$. We only consider differential star products where C_r is a bidifferential operator for all r. It follows from associativity that $\{f,g\} = \frac{1}{\mathrm{i}}(C_1(f,g) - C_1(g,f))$ is a Poisson bracket on M. Conversely, any Poisson bracket can be deformed (quantized) into a star product, this is a consequence of Kontsevich's famous formality theorem [38,39]. For an elementary introduction to Poisson geometry and deformation quantization see e.g. [45].

In order to find a reasonable definition of a deformation quantization of a principal fibre bundle one can rely on several other approaches, some of which we shall recall now:

In many approaches to gauge theories on noncommutative space-times one can read between the lines and possibly extract a good definition of a deformation quantization of a principal fibre bundle. However, it is not completely obvious as here either only local aspects are discussed, typically the Weyl-Moyal star product on a symplectic vector space, or only particular structure groups like $\mathrm{Gl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ or $\mathrm{U}(n)$. Here in particular the works of Jurčo, Schupp, Wess and co-workers, see e.g. [32–36], are discussed and developed further in the physics literature. They seem to give promising models for gauge theories on noncommutative space-times, see also [44] for a review on the geometric nature of such noncommutative field theories.

In [11–13, 41, 42] the deformation quantization of vector bundles was discussed in detail, where indeed deformed transition functions were found: this indicates a deformation quantization of the corresponding frame bundle. However, a global description of the deformed frame bundle is still missing and structure groups beyond the general linear group do not seem to be accessible by this approach. Also in [29, 30] the deformation theory of vector bundles in the context of strict deformation quantizations is discussed.

Furthermore, as quantum analogue of principal bundles the so-called *Hopf-Galois extensions* are studied in detail: here the total space P is replaced by some algebra $\mathcal{P}$, the structure Lie group G is replaced by a Hopf algebra H acting (or co-acting) on $\mathcal{P}$ and the base space M is replaced by the sub-algebra $\mathcal{M}$ of H-invariant elements in $\mathcal{P}$ together with some additional, more technical properties encoding the freeness and properness of the action, see e.g. [10] and [22, 28] for recent developments. Even though this is a very successful approach mainly used in a C^*-algebraic formulation, there are simple examples in deformation quantization where this does not seem appropriate. Taking the idea of Hopf-Galois extensions literally would lead to the following definition of a deformation quantization of a principal fibre bundle $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$. Given a star product $\star$ on M one should try to find a star product $\star_P$ on P such that the pull-back p^* can be deformed into an algebra homomorphism. Then of course, the Hopf algebra deformation and the further technical requirements still have to be found and satisfied. However, already for the first step one finds hard obstructions:

Example 1.1 Let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a surjective submersion and $\star$ a star product on M quantizing a Poisson structure $\pi_M \in \Gamma^\infty(\Lambda^2 TM)$. Assume that there exists a star product $\star_P$ on P such that p^* allows for a deformation into an algebra homomorphism

$$\mathsf{p}^* + \cdots : (C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]], \star) \longrightarrow (C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]], \star_P). \tag{1.2}$$

Let π_P denote the Poisson structure on P determined by $\star_P$. Then by a simple computation, $\mathsf{p} : (P, \pi_P) \longrightarrow (M, \pi_M)$ is a Poisson map.

Since in this situation already the lowest orders have to satisfy a condition, one has to expect obstructions. Indeed, this happens already in the following simple example:

Example 1.2 Consider the Hopf fibration $\mathsf{p} : S^3 \longrightarrow S^2$, which is a S^1-principal bundle, and a *symplectic* Poisson structure π_{S^2} on the 2-sphere S^2. Then there is no Poisson structure on S^3 making p a Poisson map. Indeed, it is easy to see that the symplectic leaves of (S^3, π_{S^3}) have to be 2-dimensional and the restriction of p to one leaf is still surjective. Thus the leaf covers S^2 whence it is diffeomorphic to S^2 via p. But this immediately gives a global section of the non-trivial principal bundle $\mathsf{p} : S^3 \longrightarrow S^2$, a contradiction. Of course this relies very much on the fact that we have chosen a symplectic Poisson structure on S^2. There are examples of Hopf-Galois extensions deforming the Hopf fibration where (necessarily) the Poisson structure on S^2 is not symplectic.

We will come back to this example in Section 6 and study the above obstruction from a more sophisticated point of view: We will see that also a deformation of p^* into a *bimodule* structure will result in hard obstructions.

Before we give the final definition, we recall the third motivation coming from deformation quantization itself: consider a big phase space $\tilde{M}$ with a coisotropic submanifold $\iota : P \longrightarrow \tilde{M}$. If the characteristic foliation of P is well-behaved enough, then the leaf space $M = P\big/\sim$ itself is a manifold such that the projection $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ is a surjective submersion. It is a well-known fact that M inherits a Poisson structure from $\tilde{M}$. A particular case is obtained if $\tilde{M}$ is equipped with a Hamiltonian group action of some Lie group G with equivariant momentum map $J : \tilde{M} \longrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$ and $P = J^{-1}(0)$ is the momentum level zero surface. In this case G acts also on P and M is the quotient $P\big/G$. In the free and proper case we have a good reduced phase space M and P is a G-principal bundle over M. This situation is the famous Marsden-Weinstein reduction, see e.g. [1], Sect. 4.3.

When it comes to deformation quantization of this picture, one wants to find a star product $\tilde{\star}$ on $\tilde{M}$ which is compatible with the 'constraint surface' P in such a way, that one can construct a star product $\star$ on M out of $\tilde{\star}$. Several options for this have been discussed like the BRST formalism [3, 9, 31] or more ad hoc constructions as in [6, 7, 26]. More recently, it became clear that a deformation of the functions on P as a *bimodule* for the deformed algebras of functions on $\tilde{M}$ and M, respectively, leads to a very satisfying picture: one should try to define a left module structure on $C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$ with respect to $\tilde{\star}$ deforming the canonical one coming from ι^* in such a way that the module endomorphisms are isomorphic to $C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]$ thereby inducing a star product $\star$ on M. This point of view has been promoted in [4, 5] where first results for the general symplectic case have been obtained. For the more general Poisson case, see [16–18], where sufficient conditions for a successful reduction where formulated.

Taking this last motivation into account it is clear that a deformation of $C^\infty(P)$ into an algebra does not seem to be appropriate at all: geometrically a deformed product would result in a Poisson structure in first order, but in phase space reduction there is *no* Poisson structure on the constraint surface P, only on $\tilde{M}$ and on M. In fact, on P one always has a Dirac structure, see e.g. the discussion in [19, 21]. Thus a deformation into a right module seems to be more adapted to the reduction picture. In fact, this will be our final definition:

Definition 1.3 (Deformation quantization of surjective submersions) Let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a surjective submersion and $\star$ be a star product on M.

i.) A deformation quantization of the surjective submersion is a $(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]], \star)$-right module structure $\bullet$ of $C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$, such that

$$f \bullet a = f \cdot \mathsf{p}^* a + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda^r \rho_r(f, a) \tag{1.3}$$

for $f \in C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$ and $a \in C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]$ with bidifferential operators ρ_r.

ii.) Two such deformations $\bullet$ and $\tilde{\bullet}$ are called equivalent if and only if there exists a formal series $T = \mathsf{id}_{C^\infty(P)} + \sum_{r=1}^\infty \lambda^r T_r$ of differential operators $T_r \in \operatorname{DiffOp}(C^\infty(P))$ such that for all $f \in C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$ and $a \in C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]$

$$T(f \bullet a) = T(f) \mathbin{\tilde{\bullet}} a. \tag{1.4}$$

iii.) A deformation quantization $\bullet$ is said to preserve the fibration if

$$(\mathsf{p}^* a) \bullet b = \mathsf{p}^*(a \star b). \tag{1.5}$$

Preserving the fibration will be a technical but yet convenient condition to impose. Clearly, it is equivalent to the condition $1 \bullet a = \mathsf{p}^* a$ by the right module property. As usual in deformation quantization we require the maps ρ_r to be bidifferential operators as already $\star$ is always assumed to be a differential star product. One can show easily that for any right module structure one necessarily has $f \bullet 1 = f$ since $1 \in C^\infty(M)$ is still the unit element with respect to $\star$. From this definition it is easy to motivate the more specific situation of a principal fibre bundle:

Definition 1.4 (Deformation quantization of principal fibre bundles) Let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a principal fibre bundle with structure group G and principal right action $\mathsf{r} : P \times G \longrightarrow P$, $\mathsf{r}_g(u) = \mathsf{r}(u, g)$, and $\star$ a star product on M.

i.) A deformation quantization of the principal fibre bundle is a G-invariant deformation quantization of the surjective submersion $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ with respect to $\star$, i.e. a right module structure $\bullet$ as in (1.3) with the additional property

$$\mathsf{r}_g^*(f \bullet a) = (\mathsf{r}_g^* f) \bullet a \tag{1.6}$$

for all $f \in C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$, $a \in C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]$, and $g \in G$.

ii.) Two such deformations $\bullet$ and $\tilde{\bullet}$ are called equivalent if they are equivalent in the sense of definition 1.3 with G-invariant operators T_r, i.e. in addition to (1.6) one has for all $g \in G$

$$\mathsf{r}_g^* \circ T_r = T_r \circ \mathsf{r}_g^*. \tag{1.7}$$

The main goal of the present paper is to prove the following two theorems about existence and uniqueness of differential deformations of surjective submersions and principal fibre bundles:

Theorem 1.5 *Every surjective submersion* $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ *with a star product* $\star$ *on* M *admits a deformation quantization which is unique up to equivalence. Moreover, one can achieve a deformation which respects the fibration.*

Theorem 1.6 *Every principal fibre bundle* $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ *with a star product* $\star$ *on* M *admits a deformation quantization which is unique up to equivalence. Again, one can achieve a deformation which respects the fibration.*

The proof of both theorems relies on an order by order construction of the deformed module structures which is possible since we are able to show that the relevant Hochschild cohomologies are trivial. With this (non-trivial) result on the Hochschild cohomology the remaining proof is very simple. To show the vanishing of the Hochschild cohomologies we heavily use techniques developed in [8]. Alternatively, the existence of such deformations follows also from a Fedosov-like construction as discussed in detail in [46] for the case where the star product on M quantizes a *symplectic* Poisson bracket.

The very satisfactory answer to the existence and classification questions indicates that our definitions for deformation quantization of surjective submersions and principal fibre bundles are reasonable. In a next step it remains to answer whether the definitions are *useful* once we have shown Theorem 1.5 and 1.6. Here we have to go back to the original motivations why a deformation quantization is desirable:

- Concerning applications in gauge theories on noncommutative space-times we would like to see how one can formulate a global and geometric approach to such gauge theories, including in particular the notions of associated bundles, connections and Yang-Mills actions. Here we have partial answers where we can show how the process of associating vector bundles is formulated very naturally in our framework. The result will be a deformed vector bundle in the sense of [13] which provides the geometric formulation of matter fields in noncommutative field theory [41]. Moreover, the action of the infinitesimal gauge transformations can be clarified and compared with the approaches in [32]. To this end, in Theorem 5.8, we compute the *commutants* of the right modules obtained by Theorem 1.5 and 1.6 within all differential operators which turn out to be deformations of the vertical differential operators on the total space. On the other hand, the role of connections still has to be clarified in our geometric and global approach.

- Concerning the relation to the Hopf-Galois extensions we can use the results on the commutant to formulate more refined obstructions for the existence of a G-invariant bimodule deformation using results from the Morita theory of star products in Corollary 6.7. Of course, in our situation the structure group itself is always the undeformed Lie group G and not a Hopf algebra deformation. Clearly, further investigations will be necessary to understand the relations between these two approaches better.
- The applications to phase space reduction of star products consist in finding hard obstructions: Since the right module deformation is unique up to equivalence the commutant is uniquely determined, too. In order to carry through the reduction process one needs to find a left module structure for the star product $\tilde{\star}$ of the big phase space on the functions on P, i.e. an algebra homomorphism into the commutant. Now, for an arbitrary choice of the star product $\star$ on M such an algebra homomorphism may or may not exist, which gives a necessary and also sufficient condition for the reduction. Clearly, this is still rather inexplicit and has to be investigated in more detail. In particular, we plan to give a comparison with the results in [4, 16–18].

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we collect some well-known facts on algebraic deformation theory in the spirit of Gerstenhaber and formulate the deformation problem of modules to introduce the relevant Hochschild cohomologies. Some particular attention is put on the fact that in the end we need more particular cochains, bidifferential ones in our case. Section 3 recalls some basic constructions from [8] which are needed to compute the Hochschild cohomologies in the local models. Here the Koszul and the bar resolutions are recalled and some explicit homotopies are given. Section 4 contains the proof of Theorem 1.5 using an order by order construction. We also compute the commutant as a deformation of the vertical differential operators. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 1.6 including also a computation of the commutant and the compatibility of the resulting bimodule structure with the G-action. Finally, in Section 6 we show how a simple tensor product construction gives the deformation quantization of associated vector bundles out of our deformation quantization of a principal fibre bundle. The commutant of the deformed right module structure on the principal fibre bundle maps onto the commutant of the deformation quantization of the associated vector bundle.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Henrique Bursztyn, Alberto Cattaneo, Simone Gutt, Brano Jurčo, Rainer Matthes, Peter Schupp, Jim Stasheff, Julius Wess, and Marco Zambon for valuable discussions and remarks.

2 Algebraic Preliminaries

In this section we recall some basic facts on the deformation theory of algebras and modules. Essentially, all stated definitions and results are well-known from the very first works of Gerstenhaber [25] and e.g. [23]. However, we will need some explicit expressions for the relevant cochains whence we present the material in a self-contained way.

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be a field of characteristic 0 and $(\mathcal{A}, \mu_0)$ an associative $\mathbb{K}$-algebra. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{E}$ be a vector space over $\mathbb{K}$ with an $\mathcal{A}$-right module structure

$$\rho_0 : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}. \tag{2.1}$$

We shall be interested in a formal associative deformation of the algebra multiplication

$$\mu = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r \mu_r : \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]] \times \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]] \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]] \tag{2.2}$$

in the sense of Gerstenhaber [25] which we assume to be given. For this given deformation μ we are looking for a deformation of the module structure (2.1), again in the framework of formal series

$$\rho = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r \rho_r : \mathcal{E}[[\lambda]] \times \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]] \longrightarrow \mathcal{E}[[\lambda]] \tag{2.3}$$

such that ρ is a right module structure with respect to μ. All $\mathbb{K}$-multilinear maps will be extended to $\mathbb{K}[[\lambda]]$-multilinear maps in the following.

In this purely algebraic framework one can now derive expressions for the obstructions to construct such deformations order by order in the deformation parameter analogously to [25]. However, we shall need a slightly more specific framework: typically, the maps μ_r have additional properties and also the ρ_r are required to have additional properties like e.g. continuity with respect to some given topology. In order to formalize this we consider Hochschild cochains of the algebra $\mathcal{A}$ of particular types. These 'types' should satisfy the following conditions which simply allow to reproduce Gerstenhaber's arguments and computations.

i.) We consider Hochschild cochains of a certain type which we denote by $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathrm{HC}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$, where $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ is required to be closed under the usual insertions $\circ_i$ after the i-th position and $\mathrm{HC}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{A}$. Moreover, we require $\mu_0 \in \mathrm{HC}^2_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$.

In particular, it follows that $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ is a subcomplex of $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ with respect to the Hochschild differential δ corresponding to μ_0. Moreover, $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ is closed under the $\cup$-product and the Gerstenhaber bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]$ and the corresponding Hochschild cohomology $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ is a Gerstenhaber algebra itself. We assume in the following that the given deformation μ of μ_0 consists of cochains $\mu_r \in \mathrm{HC}^2_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$.

For the deformation problem of the module structure we consider particular Hochschild cochains in $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}, \mathsf{End}(\mathcal{E}))$, where $\mathsf{End}(\mathcal{E})$ is given the canonical $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$-bimodule structure. In detail, we require the following:

ii.) $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathsf{End}(\mathcal{E})$ is a subalgebra with $\mathsf{id} \in \mathcal{D}$.

iii.) We consider cochains $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ with values in the subalgebra $\mathcal{D}$ where 'type' has the property that for $\phi \in \mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ and $\psi \in \mathrm{HC}^l_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ we have $\phi \circ_i \psi \in \mathrm{HC}^{k+l-1}_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$, where as usual for $a_1, \ldots, a_{k+l-1} \in \mathcal{A}$

$$(\phi \circ_i \psi)(a_1, \ldots, a_{k+l-1}) = \phi(a_1, \ldots, a_i, \psi(a_{i+1}, \ldots, a_{i+l}), a_{i+l+1}, \ldots, a_{k+l-1}). \tag{2.4}$$

Of course we want $\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{HC}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$.

iv.) Finally, for $\phi_1 \in \mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ and $\phi_2 \in \mathrm{HC}^l_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ we require $\phi_1 \circ \phi_2 \in \mathrm{HC}^{k+l}_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ where

$$(\phi_1 \circ \phi_2)(a_1, \ldots, a_{k+l}) = \phi_1(a_1, \ldots, a_k) \circ \phi_2(a_{k+1}, \ldots, a_{k+l}). \tag{2.5}$$

Of course we now require that the undeformed right module structure ρ_0 is a cochain $\rho_0 \in \mathrm{HC}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$. Being a right module structure implies that $\mathcal{D}$ is a $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$-bimodule via

$$a \cdot D \cdot b = \rho_0(b) \circ D \circ \rho_0(a), \tag{2.6}$$

where $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$ and $D \in \mathcal{D}$. This is the restriction of the canonical bimodule structure of $\mathsf{End}(\mathcal{E})$. Thus $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ is a subcomplex of $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}, \mathsf{End}(\mathcal{E}))$ whence we obtain a corresponding Hochschild cohomology denoted by $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$.

Within this refined framework we want to find a deformation ρ as in (2.3), where now all $\rho_r \in \mathrm{HC}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$. Completely analogously to the general case one obtains the following lemma:

Lemma 2.1 *Assume that $\rho^{(r)} = \rho_0 + \cdots + \lambda^r \rho_r$ is a right module structure with respect to μ up to order λ^r with $\rho_s \in \mathrm{HC}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ for all $s = 0, \ldots, r$. Then the condition for $\rho_{r+1} \in \mathrm{HC}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ to define a right module structure $\rho^{(r+1)} = \rho^{(r)} + \lambda^{r+1}\rho_{r+1}$ up to order λ^{r+1} is*

$$\delta\rho_{r+1} = R_r \tag{2.7}$$

with $R_r \in \mathrm{HC}^2_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ explicitly given by

$$R_r(a, b) = \sum_{s=0}^{r} \rho_s(\mu_{r+1-s}(a, b)) - \sum_{s=1}^{r} \rho_s(b) \circ \rho_{r+1-s}(a). \tag{2.8}$$

Moreover, $\delta R_r = 0$ whence the obstruction in order λ^{r+1} is the class $[R_r] \in \mathrm{HH}^2_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$.

PROOF: The only new aspect is that $R_r \in \mathrm{HC}^2_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ which is clear from the explicit formula and the conditions *ii.)-iv.)*. ∎

In particular, if $\mathrm{HH}^2_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) = \{0\}$, an order by order construction immediately yields the existence of a deformation ρ of the desired type.

In a next step, we consider two deformed right module structures ρ and $\tilde{\rho}$ of the given type for the same associative deformation μ of $\mathcal{A}$. Then they are called (cohomologically) equivalent if there exists a formal series

$$T = \mathsf{id} + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda^r T_r \quad \text{with} \quad T_r \in \mathcal{D} \tag{2.9}$$

such that T is a module isomorphism, i.e. for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$

$$T \circ \rho(a) = \tilde{\rho}(a) \circ T. \tag{2.10}$$

Again, the order by order construction of T gives an obstruction in the Hochschild cohomology:

Lemma 2.2 *Assume that $T^{(r)} = \mathsf{id} + \cdots + \lambda^r T_r$ is an equivalence between ρ and $\tilde{\rho}$ up to order λ^r such that $T_s \in \mathrm{HC}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ for $s = 1, \ldots, r$. Then the condition for $T_{r+1} \in \mathrm{HC}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ to define an equivalence $T^{(r+1)} = T^{(r)} + \lambda^{r+1} T_{r+1}$ up to order λ^{r+1} is*

$$\delta T_{r+1} = E_r \tag{2.11}$$

with $E_r \in \mathrm{HC}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ *explicitly given by*

$$E_r(a) = \sum_{s=0}^{r} \left(\tilde{\rho}_{r+1-s}(a) \circ T_s - T_s \circ \rho_{r+1-s}(a) \right). \tag{2.12}$$

Moreover, $\delta E_r = 0$ *whence the recursive obstruction in order* λ^{r+1} *is the class* $[E_r] \in \mathrm{HH}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$.

Proof: Again, the only new thing compared to the purely algebraic situation is the simple observation that $E_r \in \mathrm{HC}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$. ■

Note that even if an obstruction occurs in higher orders, i.e. $[E_r] \neq 0$ in $\mathrm{HH}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$, the two module deformations still might be equivalent as one is allowed to change the already found $T_1, \ldots, T_r$. This makes the classification of equivalences up to all orders very difficult in general. However, if the first cohomology $\mathrm{HH}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) = \{0\}$ is trivial, the construction of T can be done recursively and any two deformations are equivalent.

Now, we consider one example for more specific types of cochains:

Example 2.3 (Differential deformations) Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is commutative and also $\mathcal{E}$ carries the additional structure of an associative, commutative algebra. Then we consider the (algebraic) differential operators

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(\mathcal{E}) = \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(\mathcal{E}) \tag{2.13}$$

of the algebra $\mathcal{E}$. We assume for the undeformed module structure that $\rho_0(a)$ is a differential operator on $\mathcal{E}$ of order zero, i.e. $\rho_0(a) \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^0(\mathcal{E})$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is commutative, any right module is a left module and vice versa. For later use it will be convenient to deform $\mathcal{E}$ into a right module but use the $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$-bimodule structure

$$a \cdot D \cdot b = \rho_0(a) \circ D \circ \rho_0(b) \tag{2.14}$$

for the endomorphisms of $\mathcal{E}$, in contrast to (2.6). This will not affect the cohomological considerations but simplify some of the explicit formulas. For 'type' we choose the multi-differential cochains, i.e.

$$\mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) = \bigcup_{L \in \mathbb{N}_0^k} \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(\mathcal{A}, \ldots, \mathcal{A}; \mathcal{A}), \tag{2.15}$$

where $L = (l_1, \ldots, l_k)$ is the multi-index denoting the multi-order of differentiation. Moreover, we consider

$$\mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathrm{DiffOp}(\mathcal{E})) = \bigcup_{L \in \mathbb{N}_0^k} \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}_0} \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(\mathcal{A}, \ldots, \mathcal{A}; \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(\mathcal{E})), \tag{2.16}$$

where we use the *left* module structure induced by ρ_0 to specify multi-differential operators with values in $\mathrm{DiffOp}^l(\mathcal{E})$ according to (2.14). With the definition (2.16) a cochain $\phi \in \mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathrm{DiffOp}(\mathcal{E}))$ has the property that for any $a_1, \ldots, a_k \in \mathcal{A}$ the differential operator $\phi(a_1, \ldots, a_k)$ has some fixed order l independent of $a_1, \ldots, a_k$. It is now easy to verify that $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathrm{DiffOp}(\mathcal{E}))$ satisfies all requirements *i.)* to *iv.)*. Note that in general this is not true for $\bigcup_{L \in \mathbb{N}_0^k} \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(\mathcal{A}, \ldots, \mathcal{A}; \mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(\mathcal{E}))$.

In the last part of our general considerations we focus on the situation where some deformation ρ exists (e.g. since the second Hochschild cohomology is trivial) and where the first Hochschild cohomology $\mathrm{HH}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ is trivial,

$$\mathrm{HH}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) = \{0\}. \tag{2.17}$$

Then we already know that all deformations are equivalent. We shall now discuss the module endomorphisms of the deformed module. However, we do not consider general module endomorphisms but only those which are formal series of operators of the given type, i.e. in $\mathcal{D}[[\lambda]]$. So for the undeformed situation the module endomorphisms of interest are $\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) = \ker \delta \cap \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$. Clearly, they form a subalgebra of $\mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathcal{E}$ becomes a $(\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}), \mathcal{A})$-bimodule by the very definition of module endomorphisms.

For abbreviation we denote the *commutant* inside $\mathcal{D}[[\lambda]]$, i.e. the module endomorphisms of the *deformed* module, by

$$\mathcal{K} = \left\{ A \in \mathcal{D}[[\lambda]] \;\middle|\; A \circ \rho(a) = \rho(a) \circ A \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{A}[[\lambda]] \right\}. \tag{2.18}$$

We will now make use of a complementary subspace $\overline{\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ of the undeformed commutant, i.e. we choose $\overline{\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})}$ such that

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) \oplus \overline{\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})} \tag{2.19}$$

which is always possible as we work over a field $\mathbb{K}$. Then the following proposition describes the structure of $\mathcal{K}$:

Proposition 2.4 *Every choice of a complementary subspace* $\overline{\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})}$ *induces a* $\mathbb{K}$*-linear map*

$$\rho' : \mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})[[\lambda]] \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}[[\lambda]] \tag{2.20}$$

of the form $\rho' = \mathsf{id} + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda^r \rho'_r$ *with* $\rho'_r : \mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ *and the following properties:*

i.) $\rho'_r(A) \in \overline{\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})}$ *for all* $A \in \mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ *and* $r \geq 1$.

ii.) ρ' *is a* $\mathbb{K}[[\lambda]]$*-linear bijection onto* $\mathcal{K}$.

iii.) ρ' *induces an associative deformation of the classical commutant*

$$\mu'(A, B) = \rho'^{-1}\left(\rho'(A) \circ \rho'(B)\right), \tag{2.21}$$

where $A, B \in \mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})[[\lambda]]$.

iv.) ρ' *defines a left module structure for the deformed algebra* $(\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})[[\lambda]], \mu')$ *on* $\mathcal{E}[[\lambda]]$ *such that* $\mathcal{E}[[\lambda]]$ *becomes a bimodule with respect to the two deformed algebras.*

v.) Different choices of $\overline{\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})}$ *and* ρ *yield equivalent deformations of* $\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$.

vi.) Suppose in addition that $\mathrm{HH}^2_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) = \{0\}$. *Then we obtain a map*

$$\mathrm{Def}_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Def}(\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})), \tag{2.22}$$

where Def *denotes the set of equivalence classes of associative deformations.*

Proof: Let $A \in \mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ be given. We construct $\rho'(A) \in \mathcal{K}$ recursively order by order. Obviously, in zeroth order $A \in \mathcal{K}$. Assume we have already constructed correction terms $\rho'_1(A)$, $\ldots$, $\rho'_r(A)$. Then it is easy to see that the error term in order λ^{r+1} of $A + \lambda^1 \rho'_1(A) + \cdots + \lambda^r \rho'_r(A)$ to be in $\mathcal{K}$ is a δ-closed cochain in $\mathrm{HC}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$. Thus it is a coboundary by assumption (2.17) and the splitting (2.19) allows to choose a unique correction term in $\overline{\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})}$. By induction we obtain the first part and the injectivity of the second part. Conversely, if an element in the commutant $\mathcal{K}$ is given, then its lowest non-vanishing order is in $\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ which can be 'quantized' using ρ'. By a simple induction we obtain the surjectivity. The third part is obvious as $\mathcal{K}$ is an associative algebra over $\mathbb{K}[[\lambda]]$ and ρ' is the identity in zeroth order. The fourth part is clear by construction. For the last part we observe that $\mathcal{K}$ is independent of the choice of $\overline{\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})}$ whence it follows immediately that different choices of $\overline{\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})}$ give equivalent deformations. Moreover, passing to a different module deformation $\tilde{\rho}$ we obtain an equivalence between ρ and $\tilde{\rho}$ by $\mathrm{HH}^1_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}) = \{0\}$. Thus, the commutants $\mathcal{K}$ are isomorphic, too, yielding an equivalence between ρ' and $\tilde{\rho'}$. The last part is clear since for every deformation of $\mathcal{A}$ of the specified type we can deform the right module and hence $\mathrm{HH}^0_{\mathrm{type}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D})$ in a unique way up to equivalence. ■

3 The topological bar and Koszul complex of $C^\infty(V)$

In this section we recall some results on the homological algebra of $C^\infty(V)$ with a convex open subset $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. The main tools will be the topological bar resolution as well as the topological Koszul resolution of $C^\infty(V)$. Most of the material of this section is well-known and can be found in either [20], Sect. III.2.α, or [8]. Nevertheless, for later use we have to present the results in some details.

For the following considerations we need the (topological) extended algebra $\mathcal{A}^e$ which is given by

$$\mathcal{A}^e = C^\infty(V \times V). \tag{3.1}$$

Note that in a purely algebraic context the extended algebra is just $\mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A}$ but here we use the completed tensor product with respect to the canonical Fréchet topology of smooth functions, resulting in (3.1).

For the definition of the bar complex we also consider the topological version. One defines

$$X_0 = \mathcal{A}^e = C^\infty(V \times V) \quad \text{and} \quad X_k = C^\infty(V \times V^k \times V) \tag{3.2}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with the $\mathcal{A}^e$-module structures

$$(\hat{a}\chi)(v, q_1, \ldots, q_k, w) = \hat{a}(v, w)\chi(v, q_1, \ldots, q_k, w) \tag{3.3}$$

for $\hat{a} \in \mathcal{A}^e$, $\chi \in X_k$ and $v, w, q_1, \ldots, q_k \in V$. The bar complex $(X_\bullet, \partial_X)$ and the corresponding bar resolution over $\mathcal{A}$ are then given by the exact sequence

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 & \mathcal{A} \arrow[l] & X_0 \arrow[l, "\epsilon"'] & X_1 \arrow[l, "\partial^1_X"'] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\partial^2_X"'] & X_k \arrow[l, "\partial^k_X"'] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\partial^{k+1}_X"'] \end{tikzcd}, \tag{3.4}$$

where the boundary operators ∂^k_X and the augmentation ϵ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} (\partial^k_X \chi)(v, q_1, \ldots, q_{k-1}, w) &= \chi(v, v, q_1, \ldots, q_{k-1}, w) \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (-1)^i \chi(v, q_1, \ldots, q_i, q_i, \ldots, q_{k-1}, w) + (-1)^k \chi(v, q_1, \ldots, q_{k-1}, w, w) \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$(\epsilon\hat{a})(v) = \hat{a}(v,v). \tag{3.6}$$

It is well known that ∂_X^k and ϵ are homomorphisms of $\mathcal{A}^e$-modules and $\partial_X^{k-1}\circ\partial_X^k = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$ and $\epsilon\circ\partial_X^1 = 0$. The well-known homotopies $h_X^{-1} : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow X_0$ and $h_X^k : X_k \longrightarrow X_{k+1}$ are given by

$$(h_X^{-1}a)(v,w) = a(v) \quad \text{and} \quad (h_X^k\chi)(v,q_1,\ldots,q_{k+1},w) = (-1)^{k+1}\chi(v,q_1,\ldots,q_{k+1}) \tag{3.7}$$

for $k \geq 0$. Then one has

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon\circ h_X^{-1} &= \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{A}}, \\ h_X^{-1}\circ\epsilon + \partial_X^1\circ h_X^0 &= \mathsf{id}_{X_0} \quad \text{and} \\ h_X^{k-1}\circ\partial_X^k + \partial_X^{k+1}\circ h_X^k &= \mathsf{id}_{X_k} \quad \forall k\geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Hence the sequence (3.4) is exact and thus defines a resolution of $\mathcal{A}$. Note that the modules X_k are topologically free as $\mathcal{A}^e$-modules, confer [20] for a more general version of this.

For the (topological) Koszul complex one considers the (topologically free) $\mathcal{A}^e$-modules

$$K_0 = \mathcal{A}^e \quad \text{and} \quad K_k = \mathcal{A}^e\otimes_{\mathbb{R}}\Lambda^k(\mathbb{R}^n)^* \cong C^\infty(V\times V,\Lambda^k(\mathbb{R}^n)^*). \tag{3.9}$$

With a basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,n}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and the corresponding dual basis $\{e^i\}_{i=1,\ldots,n}$ of $(\mathbb{R}^n)^*$ the elements $\omega\in K_k$ can be written as

$$\omega = \frac{1}{k!}\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_k=1}^{n}\omega_{i_1\ldots i_k}e^{i_1}\wedge\ldots\wedge e^{i_k}$$

with $\omega_{i_1\ldots i_k}\in\mathcal{A}^e$. The Koszul complex $(K_\bullet,\partial_K)$ and the corresponding *finite* resolution of $\mathcal{A}$ are given by

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 & \mathcal{A} \arrow[l] & K_0 \arrow[l, "\epsilon"'] & K_1 \arrow[l, "\partial_K^1"'] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\partial_K^2"'] & K_k \arrow[l, "\partial_K^k"'] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\partial_K^{k+1}"'] & K_n \arrow[l, "\partial_K^n"'] & 0 \arrow[l] \end{tikzcd}, \tag{3.10}$$

where the augmentation $\epsilon : \mathcal{A}^e \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is the same as in (3.6) and the boundary operators ∂_K^k are defined by

$$\Big((\partial_K^k\omega)(v,w)\Big)(x_1,\ldots,x_{k-1}) = (\omega(v,w))\,(v-w,x_1,\ldots,x_{k-1}) \tag{3.11}$$

for $v,w\in V$ and $x_1,\ldots,x_{k-1}\in\mathbb{R}^n$. Again, the maps ∂_K^k are $\mathcal{A}^e$-module homomorphisms with $\partial_K^{k-1}\circ\partial_K^k = 0$ for all $k\geq 2$ and $\epsilon\circ\partial_K^1 = 0$. The maps $h_K^{-1} = h_X^{-1}$ and $h_K^k : K_k \longrightarrow K_{k+1}$ with

$$(h_K^k\omega)(v,w) = -e^j\wedge\int_0^1 t^k\frac{\partial\omega}{\partial w^j}(v,tw+(1-t)v)\,\mathrm{d}\,t \tag{3.12}$$

for $k\geq 0$ yield the homotopy identities

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon\circ h_K^{-1} &= \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{A}}, \\ h_K^{-1}\circ\epsilon + \partial_K^1\circ h_K^0 &= \mathsf{id}_{K_0} \quad \text{and} \\ h_K^{k-1}\circ\partial_K^k + \partial_K^{k+1}\circ h_K^k &= \mathsf{id}_{K_k} \quad \forall k\geq 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Hence (3.10) is indeed a topologically free resolution of $\mathcal{A}$. Note that in (3.12) we made use of the convexity of V.

For all $k \geq 0$ we consider the maps $F^k : K_k \longrightarrow X_k$ from [20] defined by

$$(F^k \omega)(v, q_1, \ldots, q_k, w) = (\omega(v, w))\,(q_1 - v, \ldots, q_k - v) \tag{3.14}$$

and the maps $G^k : X_k \longrightarrow K_k$ from [8] defined by

$$\begin{aligned}(G^k \chi)(v, w) = \sum_{i_1, \ldots, i_k = 1}^{n} & e^{i_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge e^{i_k} \int_0^1 \int_0^{t_1} \cdots \int_0^{t_{k-1}} \\ & \frac{\partial^k \chi}{\partial q_1^{i_1} \cdots \partial q_k^{i_k}} (v, t_1 v + (1 - t_1) w, \ldots, t_k v + (1 - t_k) w, w) \,\mathrm{d}\, t_1 \cdots \mathrm{d}\, t_k.\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

In particular, $F^0 = \mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{A}^e} = G^0$. Note that G^k is well-defined since we assume V to be convex. Clearly, these maps are $\mathcal{A}^e$-module homomorphisms and it is a straightforward computation to prove that F^k and G^k are chain maps, see [8, 20]. This means that for all $k \geq 0$

$$F^k \circ \partial_K^{k+1} = \partial_X^{k+1} \circ F^{k+1} \quad \text{and} \quad G^k \circ \partial_X^{k+1} = \partial_K^{k+1} \circ G^{k+1}. \tag{3.16}$$

Thus we have the commutative diagram of $\mathcal{A}^e$-module morphisms

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 & \mathcal{A} \arrow[l] \arrow[d, equal] & X_0 \arrow[l, "\epsilon"'] \arrow[d, equal, "\mathsf{id}_{\mathcal{A}^e}"'] & X_1 \arrow[l, "\partial_X^1"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "G^1"] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\partial_X^2"'] & X_k \arrow[l, "\partial_X^k"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "G^k"] & X_{k+1} \arrow[l, "\partial_X^{k+1}"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "G^{k+1}"] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\partial_X^{k+2}"'] \\
0 & \mathcal{A} \arrow[l] & K_0 \arrow[l, "\epsilon"] & K_1 \arrow[l, "\partial_K^1"] \arrow[u, shift left, "F^1"] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\partial_K^2"] & K_k \arrow[l, "\partial_K^k"] \arrow[u, shift left, "F^k"] & K_{k+1} \arrow[l, "\partial_K^{k+1}"] \arrow[u, shift left, "F^{k+1}"] & \cdots \arrow[l, "\partial_K^{k+2}"]
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.17}$$

Another direct computation shows that

$$G^k \circ F^k = \mathsf{id}_{K_k} \quad \forall k \geq 0 \tag{3.18}$$

and thus it is clear that

$$\Theta^k = F^k \circ G^k : X_k \longrightarrow X_k \tag{3.19}$$

for all $k \geq 0$ is a projection $\Theta^k \circ \Theta^k = \Theta^k$ on the bar complex with $\Theta^k \circ \partial_X^{k+1} = \partial_X^{k+1} \circ \Theta^{k+1}$. Clearly, $\Theta^0 = \mathsf{id}_{X_0}$. Applying Θ^k to the last equation of (3.8) leads to

$$\Theta^k \circ h_X^{k-1} \circ \partial_X^k + \partial_X^{k+1} \circ \Theta^{k+1} \circ h_X^k = \Theta^k. \tag{3.20}$$

Subtraction of (3.20) from (3.8) shows that the chain homomorphisms id_X and Θ are homotopic since

$$\mathsf{id}_{X_k} - \Theta^k = s^{k-1} \circ \partial_X^k + \partial_X^{k+1} \circ s^k \quad \forall k \geq 1 \tag{3.21}$$

with

$$s^{k-1} = (\mathsf{id}_{X_k} - \Theta^k) \circ h_X^{k-1} : X_{k-1} \longrightarrow X_k. \tag{3.22}$$

Note that in [8] the homotopy formula (3.21) was obtained by a recursive and less explicit definition of s^k.

Remark 3.1 From the point of view of topologically projective (even free in our case) resolutions, the explicit construction of F and G and the homotopies s is obsolete: this follows by abstract nonsense arguments. However, later on we are interested in Hochschild cochains which have additional properties beside being continuous. For this refined notion we need to prove by hand that the maps F, G, Θ, and s are compatible with these additional requirements whence we need the *explicit* formulas.

From now on, we closely follow [8]. Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a Hausdorff and complete topological $\mathcal{A}$-left module with respect to the Fréchet topology of $\mathcal{A} = C^\infty(V)$, i.e. the bilinear multiplication

$$(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{M}) \ni (a, m) \mapsto a \cdot m \in \mathcal{M} \tag{3.23}$$

is continuous. Furthermore, we demand that $\mathcal{M}$ has an $\mathcal{A}$-right module structure such that there exists an $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the right module multiplication can be expressed in terms of the left module multiplication by

$$m \cdot b = \sum_{|\beta| \leq l} \frac{\partial^{|\beta|} b}{\partial v^\beta} \cdot m^\beta \quad \forall b \in \mathcal{A}, m \in \mathcal{M} \tag{3.24}$$

with elements $m^\beta \in \mathcal{M}$ depending continuously on m. As l is uniform for $\mathcal{M}$ it follows that the trilinear map $(a, m, b) \mapsto a \cdot m \cdot b$ is continuous, too. Thus $\mathcal{M}$ is a topological *bimodule*. By continuity,

$$(a \otimes b) \cdot m = a \cdot m \cdot b \quad \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}, m \in \mathcal{M} \tag{3.25}$$

extends to a unique $\mathcal{A}^e$-left-module structure of $\mathcal{M}$ which is explicitly given by

$$\hat{a} \cdot m = \sum_{|\beta| \leq l} \left(v \mapsto \left. \frac{\partial^{|\beta|} \hat{a}}{\partial w^\beta}(v, w) \right|_{w=v} \right) \cdot m^\beta \quad \forall \hat{a} \in \mathcal{A}^e. \tag{3.26}$$

For the rest of this section we use a definition of differential maps, which is slightly different to the purely algebraic definition.

Definition 3.2 Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. An $\mathbb{R}$-multi-linear map $\phi : \mathcal{A} \times \ldots \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ with k arguments is said to be differential of multi-order $L = (l_1, \ldots, l_k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$, if it has the form

$$\phi(a_1, \ldots, a_k) = \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq l_1, \ldots, |\alpha_k| \leq l_k} \left(\frac{\partial^{|\alpha_1|} a_1}{\partial v^{\alpha_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{|\alpha_k|} a_k}{\partial v^{\alpha_k}} \right) \cdot \phi^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k} \tag{3.27}$$

with multi-indices $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and $\phi^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k} \in \mathcal{M}$. The L-differential maps are denoted by $\mathrm{DiffOp}^L(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$.

Remark 3.3 *i.)* Clearly, any differential map in the sense of Definition 3.2 is continuous.

ii.) For many examples of modules $\mathcal{M}$, like the one of interest in the present paper, Definition 3.2 is consistent with the purely algebraic definition of multi-differential operators.

In this sense, (3.24) means that the right module structure is differential with respect to the left one, so $\phi_m : b \mapsto m \cdot b$ is a differential operator depending on m of order l.

For $k \geq 0$ we now consider the vector space $\mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{cont}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_k, \mathcal{M})$ of all $\mathcal{A}^e$-linear and *continuous* maps, which is both an $\mathcal{A}$- and an $\mathcal{A}^e$-module. Using the pull-backs $\delta_X^{k-1} = (\partial_X^k)^*$ it is clear that $(\mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{cont}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_\bullet, \mathcal{M}), \delta_X)$ is a well-defined complex. With the above results the Hochschild complex $(\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{cont}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}), \delta)$ of *continuous cochains* is well-defined, too. By continuity, the maps $\Xi^k : \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{cont}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_k, \mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{cont}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M})$ defined by

$$\left(\Xi^k(\psi)\right)(a_1, \ldots, a_k) = \psi(1 \otimes a_1 \otimes \ldots \otimes a_k \otimes 1) \tag{3.28}$$

are bijective. Additionally, it can be shown that

$$\Xi \circ \delta_X = \delta \circ \Xi, \tag{3.29}$$

so Ξ is even an isomorphism of complexes. Definition 3.2 and (3.24) assure that the continuous Hochschild complex contains the subcomplex of differential cochains in the sense of Definition 3.2. In this section we will denote this subcomplex by $(\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}), \delta)$ with a slight abuse of notation. In the next section we will specialize to a particular bimodule $\mathcal{M}$ for which this coincides with Example 2.3. This and (3.28) motivate the following definition.

Definition 3.4 Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. An element $\psi \in \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_k, \mathcal{M})$ is said to be differential of multi-order $L = (l_1, \ldots, l_k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$, if it has the form

$$\psi = \sum_{\substack{|\alpha_1| \leq l_1, \ldots, |\alpha_k| \leq l_k \\ |\beta| \leq l}} \left(v \mapsto \left. \frac{\partial^{|\alpha_1| + \cdots + |\alpha_k| + |\beta|}}{\partial q_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots \partial q_k^{\alpha_k} \partial w^\beta} \right|_{\substack{q_1 = \ldots = q_k = v \\ w = v}} (\cdot) \right) \cdot \psi^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k \beta} \tag{3.30}$$

with multi-indices $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_k, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and $\psi^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k \beta} \in \mathcal{M}$. The differential elements of multi-order L are denoted by $\mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}, L}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_k, \mathcal{M})$.

Equation (3.30) means that under the map ψ an element $\chi \in X_k$ first gets differentiated and then evaluated at $q_1 = \ldots = q_k = w = v$. Finally, this expression, seen as a function of $v \in V$ and therefore as an element in $\mathcal{A}$, is multiplied with elements of $\mathcal{M}$ from the left. A direct computation shows that $\mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_\bullet, \mathcal{M})$ is a subcomplex of $\mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{cont}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_\bullet, \mathcal{M})$. By the very construction, (3.28) restricts to an isomorphism of complexes

$$\Xi : \left(\mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_\bullet, \mathcal{M}), \delta_X\right) \longrightarrow (\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}), \delta)\,. \tag{3.31}$$

In a last step we consider the complex $(\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathcal{M}), \delta_K)$ with $\delta_K^{k-1} = (\partial_K^k)^*$ and find the following important proposition.

Proposition 3.5 *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The pull-backs*

$$(G^k)^* : \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_k, \mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}, L}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_k, \mathcal{M}) \tag{3.32}$$

only take values in the differential cochains of multi-order $L = (l+1, \ldots, l+1)$. With the same multi-index L we have

$$(\Theta^k)^* : \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_k, \mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}, L}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_k, \mathcal{M}). \tag{3.33}$$

Further, the pull-backs $(h_X^k)^*$ restrict to the differential complex in such a way that

$$(h_X^k)^* : \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}, L}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_{k+1}, \mathcal{M}) \longrightarrow \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}, \tilde{L}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_k, \mathcal{M}) \tag{3.34}$$

for all $L = (l_1, \ldots, l_{k+1}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{k+1}$ with $\tilde{L} = (l_1, \ldots, l_k)$.

Proof: All assertions follow from easy computations and an explicit counting of the orders of differentiation. ■

With the corresponding pull-backs $(F^k)^*$ we get the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\cdots \arrow[r, "\delta_X^{k-1}"] & \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_k, \mathcal{M}) \arrow[r, "\delta_X^k"] \arrow[d, shift right, "(F^k)^*"'] & \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_{k+1}, \mathcal{M}) \arrow[r, "\delta_X^{k+1}"] \arrow[d, shift right, "(F^{k+1})^*"'] & \cdots \\
\cdots \arrow[r, "\delta_X^{k-1}"] & \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_k, \mathcal{M}) \arrow[r, "\delta_K^k"] \arrow[u, shift right, "(G^k)^*"'] & \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_{k+1}, \mathcal{M}) \arrow[r, "\delta_K^{k+1}"] \arrow[u, shift right, "(G^{k+1})^*"'] & \cdots .
\end{tikzcd} \tag{3.35}$$

With Proposition 3.5 we thus have a corresponding equation to (3.21) and consequently the complexes in (3.35) have the same cohomologies. Together with the isomorphism (3.31), we get the isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{HH}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}) \cong \mathrm{H}(\mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_\bullet, \mathcal{M})) \cong \mathrm{H}(\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathcal{M})) \tag{3.36}$$

for the cohomology of the differential Hochschild complex. Note that every isomorphism in (3.36) is induced by explicitly given maps on the level of cochains. Concerning our further application of these results, we need the following obvious generalization.

Proposition 3.6 *Let $\mathcal{M}^\bullet = \bigcup_{l=0}^\infty \mathcal{M}^l$ be a filtered $\mathcal{A}$-module, i.e. $\mathcal{M}^l \subset \mathcal{M}^{l+1}$ and $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{M}^l \subset \mathcal{M}^l$ for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, such that every $\mathcal{M}^l$ satisfies the properties above. Moreover, the topologies have to respect the filtration, which means that for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$ the topology of $\mathcal{M}^l$ is given by the induced one from $\mathcal{M}^{l+1}$. Then we have:*

i.) The unions

$$\left(\bigcup_{l=0}^\infty \mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}^l), \delta\right), \left(\bigcup_{l=0}^\infty \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_\bullet, \mathcal{M}^l), \delta_X\right), \text{ and } \left(\bigcup_{l=0}^\infty \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathcal{M}^l), \delta_K\right) \tag{3.37}$$

are sub-complexes of $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}^\bullet)$, $\mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{cont}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_\bullet, \mathcal{M}^\bullet)$, and $\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathcal{M}^\bullet)$, respectively.

ii.) The isomorphisms (3.31) for each l induce an isomorphism of complexes

$$\Xi : \left(\bigcup_{l=0}^\infty \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_\bullet, \mathcal{M}^l), \delta_X\right) \longrightarrow \left(\bigcup_{l=0}^\infty \mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{M}^l), \delta\right). \tag{3.38}$$

iii.) The pull-backs $(G^k)^*, (F^k)^*, (\Theta^k)^*, (h_X^k)^*$ and $(s^k)^*$ naturally extend to the complexes (3.37). Thus, we have induced isomorphisms for the corresponding cohomologies.

4 Deformation Quantization of Surjective Submersions

In this section we prove Theorem 1.5. Thus let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a surjective submersion with total space P and basis M of dimension n. It is easy to see that the smooth functions $C^\infty(M)$ and $C^\infty(P)$ endowed with the point-wise product and the right module structure

$$\rho_0(f, a) = f \cdot \mathsf{p}^* a \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(P), a \in C^\infty(M) \tag{4.1}$$

satisfy all assumptions of Example 2.3.

Remark 4.1 For any manifold M and any $C^\infty(M)$-(bi)module $\mathcal{M}$ we use the abbreviations

$$\mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(M) = \mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(C^\infty(M); C^\infty(M)), \tag{4.2}$$

$$\mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(\underbrace{C^\infty(M), \ldots, C^\infty(M)}_{k\text{-times}}; \mathcal{M}) \tag{4.3}$$

for $L = (l_1, \ldots, l_k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, we set

$$\mathrm{HC}^\bullet(M, \mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{HC}^\bullet(C^\infty(M), \mathcal{M}). \tag{4.4}$$

As we are interested in differential deformations of (4.1), we have to consider the Hochschild complex $\mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}(P))$ as in Example 2.3. A straightforward generalization of the well-known considerations for ordinary differential operators, see e.g. [45], App. A.5, shows that in the present situation we have the expected local expressions.

Lemma 4.2 *Let (U, x) be a local chart of M and $\phi \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(P))$ with multi-order of differentiation $L = (l_1, \ldots, l_k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$. Then there exist uniquely defined differential operators $\phi_U^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k} \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U))$ with multi-indices $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, such that*

$$\phi(a_1, \ldots, a_k)|_{\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U)} = \sum_{|\alpha_1| \leq l_1, \ldots, |\alpha_k| \leq l_k} \left(\frac{\partial^{|\alpha_1|} a_1}{\partial x^{\alpha_1}} \cdots \frac{\partial^{|\alpha_k|} a_k}{\partial x^{\alpha_k}} \right) \cdot \phi_U^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k} \tag{4.5}$$

for all $a_1, \ldots, a_k \in C^\infty(M)$, where $|_{\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U)}$ denotes the restriction of differential operators.

Remark 4.3 It is easy to check that Lemma 4.2 even holds for $\phi \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(P))$ with a fixed $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $\phi_U^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k} \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U))$.

Lemma 4.4 *Let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a surjective submersion. Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)) = \bigcup_{L \in \mathbb{N}_0^k} \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(P)). \tag{4.6}$$

PROOF: By (2.16) we have to prove that $\mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)) \subseteq \bigcup_{l=0}^\infty \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(P))$ for all $L \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$. Locally, this follows from (4.5), since the degree l of the restricted operator $\phi(a_1, \ldots, a_k)|_U \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U))$ is limited by the degrees of the finitely many $\phi_U^{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_k}$ which do not depend on $a_1, \ldots, a_k$. Globally, one shows by appropriately chosen $a_1, \ldots, a_k$ that there is a uniform bound on the locally defined degrees l according to (4.5). ■

The strategy to compute the differential Hochschild cohomologies includes three steps. First we observe that the Hochschild complex can be localized. In a second step we consider a surjective submersion $\mathsf{pr}_1 : V \times G \longrightarrow V$ with a manifold G and an open convex subset $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. For that case we will be able to compute the Hochschild cohomologies using the techniques developed in Section 3. Using a partition of unity, we show that this result is sufficient to compute the Hochschild cohomologies we started with.

By the constant rank theorem for any point $u \in P$ there exist open subsets $\tilde{U} \subset P$ with $u \in \tilde{U}$ and $U \subset M$ with $p = \mathsf{p}(u) \in U$ together with diffeomorphisms $x : U \longrightarrow V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tilde{x} : \tilde{U} \longrightarrow V \times G \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$, such that $\mathsf{p}(\tilde{U}) = U$ and $x \circ \mathsf{p} \circ \tilde{x}^{-1} = \mathsf{pr}_1$. Clearly, in this case $G \subset \mathbb{R}^k$ is an open subset. Furthermore, it is possible to achieve that $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is convex. With such adapted local charts $(\tilde{U}, \tilde{x})$ of P and (U, x) of M, which we will use throughout, we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P \arrow[d, "\mathsf{p}"'] & \mathsf{p}^{-1}(U) \arrow[l, hook', "\iota"'] \arrow[d, "\mathsf{p}"'] & \tilde{U} \arrow[l, hook', "\iota"'] \arrow[d, "\mathsf{p}"'] \arrow[r, "\tilde{x}"] & V \times G \subset \mathbb{R}^{n+k} \arrow[d, "\mathsf{pr}_1"'] \\
M & U \arrow[l, hook', "\iota"'] \arrow[r, equal] & U \arrow[r, "x"] & V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n},
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.7}$$

where ι in every case denotes the embedding map. Every column of this diagram is again the diagram of a surjective submersion with a canonical right module structure for the corresponding algebras of smooth functions.

Lemma 4.5 *The restriction maps and local charts give rise to chain maps*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{HC}^{\bullet}_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)) \arrow[d] & \\
\mathrm{HC}^{\bullet}_{\mathrm{diff}}(U, \mathrm{DiffOp}(\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U))) \arrow[d] & \\
\mathrm{HC}^{\bullet}_{\mathrm{diff}}(U, \mathrm{DiffOp}(\tilde{U})) \arrow[r, "\cong"] & \mathrm{HC}^{\bullet}_{\mathrm{diff}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)).
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.8}$$

In the second step we now compute the Hochschild cohomology $\mathrm{HH}^{\bullet}_{\mathrm{diff}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G))$.

Lemma 4.6 *Proposition 3.6 can be applied for* $\mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)$. *Hence we have*

$$\mathrm{HC}^{\bullet}_{\mathrm{diff}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)) \cong \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}^{\mathrm{diff}}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(X_{\bullet}, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l}(V \times G)) \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$\mathrm{HH}^{\bullet}_{\mathrm{diff}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)) \cong \mathrm{H}\left(\bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_{\bullet}, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l}(V \times G)) \right). \tag{4.10}$$

Proof: For $\mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G) = \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l}(V \times G)$ the preconditions of Proposition 3.6 are easily checked using the natural Fréchet topology and the given $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$-bimodule structure (2.14) of $\mathrm{DiffOp}^{l}(V \times G)$. Condition (3.24) is a simple consequence of the Leibniz rule. By Lemma 4.2 and Remark 4.3 the algebraic notion of a differential operator and the one of Definition 3.2 coincide. ■

Note that in particular the notions of $\mathrm{HC}_{\mathrm{diff}}$ as in Example 2.3 and Section 3 coincide in this case justifying thereby our previous abuse of notation.

The crucial step for all further considerations is the following explicit computation of the cohomology of $\bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_{\bullet}, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l}(V \times G))$.

Remark 4.7 In the following we make use of the well-known symbol calculus for differential operators. Depending on a torsion-free covariant derivative ∇ on a manifold M, every differential operator $D \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l}(M)$ can be identified with a unique series $T_0, \ldots, T_l$ of symmetric multi-vector fields $T_j \in \Gamma^{\infty}(S^{j}TM)$, $j = 0, \ldots, l$, which yield $D = \sum_{j=0}^{l} D_{T_j}$. Here,

$$D_{T_j}(a) = \frac{1}{j!} \left\langle T_j, \mathsf{D}^{(j)} a \right\rangle \quad \forall a \in C^{\infty}(M), \tag{4.11}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the natural pairing of symmetric multi-vector fields with symmetric differential forms and $\mathsf{D}^{(j)} = \frac{1}{j!}\mathsf{D}^j$ denotes the j-fold symmetrized covariant derivative, which in local coordinates is given by $\mathsf{D} = \mathrm{d}x^i \vee \nabla_{\frac{\partial}{\partial x^i}}$. Finally, $\sigma(D) = T_0 + \cdots + T_l \in \bigoplus_{r=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^\infty(S^r TM)$ is called the symbol of D with respect to ∇.

In the present situation we can use the product structure of $V \times G$ and the fact that $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ to find that every operator $D \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)$ can be written in the form

$$Df = \sum_{r=0}^{l} \underbrace{\sum_{s=r}^{l} T^{i_1\ldots i_r}_{j_1\ldots j_{s-r}} \left\langle X^{j_1} \vee \cdots \vee X^{j_{s-r}}, \mathsf{D}_G^{(s-r)} \circ \frac{\partial^r f}{\partial x^{i_1} \cdots \partial x^{i_r}} \right\rangle}_{=D_r}, \tag{4.12}$$

where $T^{i_1\ldots i_r}_{j_1\ldots j_{s-r}} \in C^\infty(V \times G)$ and $X^j \in \Gamma^\infty(TG) \subset \Gamma^\infty(T(V \times G))$. Here, the symmetrized covariant derivative D_G belongs to a torsion-free covariant derivative ∇^G on G, which both can be extended to $V \times G$. Thus we have a decomposition

$$\mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G) = \bigoplus_{r=0}^{l} \mathrm{DiffOp}^l_r(V \times G) \tag{4.13}$$

where $D_r \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^l_r(V \times G)$ has the form as in (4.12). By linear extension of

$$\deg D_r = r D_r \quad \forall D_r \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^l_r(V \times G) \tag{4.14}$$

we obtain a map $\deg : \mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(V \times G) \longrightarrow \mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(V \times G)$. With the decomposition (4.13) we get

$$\mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)) = \bigoplus_{r=0}^{l} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l_r(V \times G)) \tag{4.15}$$

for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus we can consider the corresponding map $\deg : \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G))$ which is again defined by linear extension of

$$\deg \psi = r\psi \quad \forall \psi \in \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l_r(V \times G)). \tag{4.16}$$

Clearly, $(\deg \psi)(\omega) = \deg(\psi(\omega))$ for all $\psi \in \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_k, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G))$, and $\omega \in K_k$ with $l, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The following lemma is obvious.

Lemma 4.8 *Let $D \in \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)$ and $x^i : V \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the coordinate functions with respect to the canonical basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,n}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Moreover, define $\xi^i = x^i \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes x^i \in C^\infty(V \times V)$. Then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left((D \cdot x^j) \circ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} - (x^j \cdot D) \circ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \right) = \deg D \tag{4.17}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(((-\xi^j) \cdot D) \circ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \right) = \deg D. \tag{4.18}$$

Definition 4.9 We define the map

$$\delta_K^{-1} : \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_{\bullet-1}, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)) \tag{4.19}$$

by the linear extension of the maps

$$(\delta_K^{-1})^k \psi = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{k+r} (\delta_K^*)^k \psi & \text{for } k + r \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } k = 0 = r \end{cases} \tag{4.20}$$

for $\psi \in \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_k, \mathrm{DiffOp}_r^l(V \times G))$ and $k \geq 0$, where the $\mathcal{A}^e$-linear map

$$(\delta_K^*)^k : \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_k, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_{k-1}, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)) \tag{4.21}$$

is defined by

$$((\delta_K^*)^k \psi)(e^{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e^{i_{k-1}}) = - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \psi(e^j \wedge e^{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e^{i_{k-1}}) \circ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}. \tag{4.22}$$

Remark 4.10 Note that by definition we have

$$\delta_K^{-1} : \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathrm{DiffOp}_r^l(V \times G)) \longrightarrow \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_{\bullet-1}, \mathrm{DiffOp}_{r+1}^{l+1}(V \times G)) \quad \forall r \leq l \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{4.23}$$

These maps turn out to be explicit homotopies for the Koszul complex:

Proposition 4.11 *For $1 \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$ the map δ_K^{-1} yields an explicit homotopy for the Koszul complex $\bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G))$, i.e.*

$$\delta_K^{k-1} \circ (\delta_K^{-1})^k + (\delta_K^{-1})^{k+1} \circ \delta_K^k = \mathsf{id}\,. \tag{4.24}$$

It follows that the Koszul cohomology is trivial for $k \geq 1$, i.e.

$$\mathrm{H}\left(\bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_k, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)) \right) = \{0\}. \tag{4.25}$$

PROOF: With use of the maps ξ^i of Lemma 4.8 it is easy to see that the differentials δ_K^k can be written as

$$(\delta_K^k \psi)(e^{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e^{i_{k+1}}) = \psi \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \xi^j \, \mathrm{i_a}(e_j)(e^{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e^{i_{k+1}}) \right) \quad \forall i_s \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, \tag{4.26}$$

where $\mathrm{i_a}$ denotes the insertion map for the antisymmetric forms of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Lemma 4.8 leads to

$$\delta_K^{k-1} \circ (\delta_K^*)^k + (\delta_K^*)^{k+1} \circ \delta_K^k = \deg + k \, \mathsf{id}, \tag{4.27}$$

which finally yields (4.24). The last statement is an immediate consequence. ■

Theorem 4.12 (Hochschild cohomology, local situation) *Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open and convex subset and let G be a manifold. Then we have for all $1 \leq k \in \mathbb{N}$:*

i.) The k-th differential Hochschild cohomology with values in $\mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)$ *is trivial*

$$\mathrm{HH}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)) = \{0\}. \tag{4.28}$$

ii.) There exists an explicit homotopy

$$\delta^{k-1} \circ (\delta^{-1})^k + (\delta^{-1})^{k+1} \circ \delta^k = \mathsf{id}, \tag{4.29}$$

where the maps $(\delta^{-1})^k : \mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{HC}^{k-1}_{\mathrm{diff}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G))$ *are given by*

$$(\delta^{-1})^k = \Xi \circ \Big((G^{k-1})^* \circ (\delta_K^{-1})^k \circ (F^k)^* + (s^{k-1})^* \Big) \circ \Xi^{-1}. \tag{4.30}$$

iii.) In particular, for any multi-index $L = (l_1, \ldots, l_k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$ *we have*

$$\delta^{-1} : \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)) \longrightarrow \mathrm{DiffOp}^{\tilde{L}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l+1}(V \times G)), \tag{4.31}$$

where the new multi-index $\tilde{L} = (\tilde{l}_1, \ldots, \tilde{l}_{k-1}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^{k-1}$ *is given by*

$$\tilde{l}_i = \max\{l_i, l+2\} \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, k-1. \tag{4.32}$$

PROOF: The proof of equation (4.29) is a simple computation which makes use of (4.24), (3.21) and the properties of the involved functions. Then, equation (4.28) is trivial. With (3.22) we have $(s^{k-1})^* = (h_X^{k-1})^* \circ (\mathsf{id} - (G^k)^* \circ (F^k)^*)$. Thus, the third assertion (4.31) is clear with Proposition 3.5 and Remark 4.10 by counting the orders of differentiation, since Ξ does not change any of them.

■

In the third and last step we use this local result to compute the Hochschild cohomologies for arbitrary surjective submersions. For this purpose we consider the vertical differential operators $D \in \mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)$ which are defined by the condition

$$D(f \cdot \mathsf{p}^* a) = D(f) \cdot \mathsf{p}^* a \quad \forall a \in C^\infty(M), f \in C^\infty(P). \tag{4.33}$$

Theorem 4.13 (Hochschild cohomology for surjective submersions) *Let* $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ *be a surjective submersion. Then*

$$\mathrm{HH}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) & \textit{for } k = 0 \\ \{0\} & \textit{for } k \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{4.34}$$

More specifically, every $\phi \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(P))$ *with* $L = (l_1, \ldots, l_k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$, $k \geq 1$, *and* $\delta\phi = 0$ *is of the form*

$$\phi = \delta\Theta, \tag{4.35}$$

where $\Theta \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^{\tilde{L}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l+1}(P))$ *and* $\tilde{L}$ *as in (4.32).*

PROOF: The case $k = 0$ is clear from the definition (4.33). For $k \geq 1$ we consider atlases $\{(\tilde{U}_\alpha, \tilde{x}_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in I}$ of P and $\{(U_\alpha, x_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in I}$ of M consisting of adapted local charts. In addition, let $\{\tilde{\chi}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$ be a locally finite partition of unity for P which is subordinate to the open cover $\{\tilde{U}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$, so $\tilde{\chi}_\alpha \in C^\infty(P)$ with $\operatorname{supp} \tilde{\chi}_\alpha \subset \tilde{U}_\alpha$ and $\sum_{\alpha \in I} \tilde{\chi}_\alpha = 1$. Then, let $\phi \in \mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}(P))$

be closed, $\delta\phi = 0$. By definition there exists an $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and a multi-index $L \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$ with $\phi \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(P))$. Due to Lemma 4.5 the restrictions $\phi_{\tilde{U}_\alpha} \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(U_\alpha, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(\tilde{U}_\alpha))$ are closed, too. Theorem 4.12 then ensures that these elements are exact: with (4.29) there exist $\Theta_\alpha \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^{\tilde{L}}(U_\alpha, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l+1}(\tilde{U}_\alpha))$, $\tilde{L} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{k-1}$ as in (4.32), with $\delta\Theta_\alpha = \phi_{\tilde{U}_\alpha}$. The restrictions

$$\Theta_{\tilde{\chi}_\alpha}(a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1})|_{\tilde{U}_\alpha} = \tilde{\chi}_\alpha|_{\tilde{U}_\alpha} \Theta_\alpha \left(a_1|_{U_\alpha}, \ldots, a_{k-1}|_{U_\alpha}\right)$$

and $\Theta_{\tilde{\chi}_\alpha}(a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1})|_{P \setminus \operatorname{supp} \tilde{\chi}_\alpha} = 0$ define global elements $\Theta_{\tilde{\chi}_\alpha} \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^{\tilde{L}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l+1}(P))$. It is an easy computation which shows that $\delta\Theta_{\tilde{\chi}_\alpha} = \tilde{\chi}_\alpha \phi$. Due to the local finiteness of the partition of unity it is clear that $\Theta = \sum_{\alpha \in I} \Theta_{\chi_\alpha} \in \mathrm{HC}^{k-1}_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l+1}(P))$ is a well-defined differential operator, which finally yields the aspired exactness of ϕ via Θ fulfilling the requirements in (4.35),

$$\phi = \left(\sum_{\alpha \in I} \tilde{\chi}_\alpha\right) \phi = \sum_{\alpha \in I} (\tilde{\chi}_\alpha \phi) = \sum_{\alpha \in I} \delta\Theta_{\tilde{\chi}_\alpha} = \delta \sum_{\alpha \in I} \Theta_{\tilde{\chi}_\alpha} = \delta\Theta.$$

■

Due to this result and those of Section 2 we find the existence and the uniqueness of deformed right module structures. So, the first part of Theorem 1.5 is proven.

Corollary 4.14 *Every surjective submersion admits a deformation quantization which is unique up to equivalence.*

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 1.5, we have to show that there always exists a deformation quantization which preserves the fibration. For this purpose we have to make some choices of geometrical structures: first we choose a connection on P, i.e. a decomposition

$$TP = VP \oplus HP \tag{4.36}$$

of the tangent bundle into the canonically given vertical bundle $VP = \ker T\mathsf{p}$ and a horizontal bundle HP. Then, any vector field $X \in \Gamma^\infty(TM)$ has a horizontal lift $X^{\mathrm{h}} \in \Gamma^\infty(HP)$ which is uniquely defined by the two demands that X^{h} is horizontal and p-related to X, $T\mathsf{p} \circ X^{\mathrm{h}} = X \circ \mathsf{p}$. Second, we choose an always existing torsion-free covariant derivative ∇^P on TP, which respects the vertical bundle. This means that $\nabla^P_Z V \in \Gamma^\infty(VP)$ for all vertical vector fields $V \in \Gamma^\infty(VP)$ and arbitrary vector fields $Z \in \Gamma^\infty(TP)$. The following lemma is a simple computation.

Lemma 4.15 *Let $TP = VP \oplus HP$ be a connection and let ∇^P be a torsion-free covariant derivative, which respects the vertical bundle. Then we have:*

i.) The equation

$$T\mathsf{p} \circ \nabla^P_{X^{\mathrm{h}}} Y^{\mathrm{h}} = \left(\nabla^M_X Y\right) \circ \mathsf{p} \quad \forall X, Y \in \Gamma^\infty(TM) \tag{4.37}$$

defines a torsion-free covariant derivative ∇^M on M.

ii.) For all $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the corresponding symmetrized covariant derivatives $\mathsf{D}^{(l)}_P$ and $\mathsf{D}^{(l)}_M$ are related by

$$\mathsf{D}^{(l)}_P \circ \mathsf{p}^* = \mathsf{p}^* \circ \mathsf{D}^{(l)}_M. \tag{4.38}$$

Lemma 4.16 *Let $\bullet$ be a deformation quantization of a surjective submersion $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$. Then there exists a formal series $T = \mathsf{id} + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda^r T_r$ of differential operators $T_r \in \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)$ such that*

$$T(\mathsf{p}^* a) = 1 \bullet a \quad \forall a \in C^\infty(M). \tag{4.39}$$

Proof: With $f \bullet a = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r \rho_r(f, a)$ it is obvious that $D_r(a) = \rho_r(1, a)$ for all r defines a differential operator $D_r \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l_r}(M, C^\infty(P))$ with $l_r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. An according symbol calculus with respect to the structures of Lemma 4.15 shows that

$$D_r(a) = \sum_{s=0}^{l_r} \left\langle T_s^r, \mathsf{p}^* \mathsf{D}_M^{(s)} a \right\rangle \quad \text{with} \quad T_s^r \in \Gamma^\infty(HP). \tag{4.40}$$

Then we define $T_r \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l_r}(P)$ by

$$T_r(f) = \sum_{s=0}^{l_r} \left\langle T_s^r, \mathsf{D}_P^{(s)} f \right\rangle. \tag{4.41}$$

Clearly, $T_0 = \mathsf{id}$ and with (4.38) we find $T_r(\mathsf{p}^* a) = D_r(a)$ which proves the lemma. ■

With this lemma we now conclude the proof of Theorem 1.5.

Corollary 4.17 *Every surjective submersion admits a deformation quantization which preserves the fibration.*

Proof: Let $\bullet$ be an arbitrary deformation quantization. Since the map T in Lemma 4.16 has all properties of an equivalence transformation, $f \mathbin{\tilde{\bullet}} a = T^{-1}(Tf \bullet a)$ defines a new deformation quantization $\tilde{\bullet}$. With (4.39) we then get $(\mathsf{p}^* a) \mathbin{\tilde{\bullet}} b = \mathsf{p}^*(a \star b)$ for all $a, b \in C^\infty(M)$. ■

Theorem 4.13 further ensures that we can apply Proposition 2.4. Thus, every choice of a deformation quantization $\bullet$ and a decomposition

$$\mathrm{DiffOp}(P) = \mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \oplus \overline{\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)} \tag{4.42}$$

leads to an isomorphism

$$\rho' : \mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]] \longrightarrow \{D \in \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)[[\lambda]] \mid D(f \bullet a) = D(f) \bullet a\} \tag{4.43}$$

with $\rho' = \mathsf{id} + \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \lambda^r \rho'_r$ and an associative deformation $(\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]], \mu')$ of $\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)$. Using the definitions

$$A \bullet' f = \rho'(A) f \quad \text{and} \quad A \star' B = \mu'(A, B), \tag{4.44}$$

for all $A, B \in \mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]]$ and $f \in C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$, the functions $C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$ inherit a $(\star', \star)$-bimodule structure which is shortly denoted by

$$_{(\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]], \star')}(\bullet', C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]], \bullet)_{(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]], \star)}. \tag{4.45}$$

Proposition 4.18 *The commutant of $\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]]$ acting via $\bullet'$ on $C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$ is given by $C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]$ acting via $\bullet$. Thus the two algebras in (4.45) are mutual commutants.*

Proof: Let $A = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \lambda^r A_r$ satisfy $A(D \bullet' f) = D \bullet' (Af)$ for all $D \in \mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]]$ and $f \in C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$. It follows that in zeroth order A_0 commutes with all undeformed left multiplications with functions $D \in C^\infty(P)$. Hence $A_0 \in C^\infty(P)$. Moreover, since A_0 commutes with all $D \in \mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)$ in zeroth order, A_0 is constant in fibre directions, i.e. $A_0 = \mathsf{p}^* a_0$ for some $a_0 \in C^\infty(M)$. Since $A(D \bullet' f) - (D \bullet' f) \bullet a_0 = D \bullet' (Af - f \bullet a_0)$ and since $Af - f \bullet a_0$ has vanishing zeroth order we can proceed by induction. ■

Remark 4.19 Even though the two algebras are mutual commutants the bimodule is *not* a Morita equivalence bimodule. This is not even true on the classical level. However, we will see in Section 6 the relation to Morita theory.

5 Deformation Quantization of Principal Bundles

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.6 and therefore consider deformations of the right module structures which appear in the special case of principal fibre bundles. As we will see, the general results for surjective submersions of Section 4 can be applied and even simplified in some parts.

So, in this section, let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a principal fibre bundle with total space P, basis M, structure Lie group G and principal right action $\mathsf{r} : P \times G \longrightarrow P$ as in the introduction. As usual we write $\mathsf{r}_g(u) = \mathsf{r}(u, g)$ for $u \in P$ and $g \in G$. Now, the undeformed right module structure (4.1) has the further property of G-invariance,

$$\mathsf{r}_g^* \circ \rho_0(a) = \rho_0(a) \circ \mathsf{r}_g^*. \tag{5.1}$$

Since the aspired deformation should preserve this, we now have to consider the G-invariant differential operators

$$\mathrm{DiffOp}(P)^G = \{ D \in \mathrm{DiffOp}(P) \mid \mathsf{r}_g^* \circ D = D \circ \mathsf{r}_g^* \quad \forall g \in G \} \tag{5.2}$$

instead of all differential operators. It is clear that the bimodule structure (2.14) is compatible with the right action, i.e. $\mathrm{DiffOp}(P)^G$ is a sub-bimodule. Following our general framework we have to use the differential Hochschild complex with values in this bimodule $\mathrm{DiffOp}(P)^G$.

Due to the properties of a principal fibre bundle, for any $p \in M$ there exist an open subset $U \subset M$ with $p \in U$ and diffeomorphisms $x : M \supseteq U \longrightarrow V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\varphi : P \supseteq \mathsf{p}^{-1}(U) \longrightarrow U \times G$ with $\mathsf{pr}_1 \circ \varphi = \mathsf{p}$ and $\varphi \circ \mathsf{r}_g = (\mathsf{id}_U \times r_g) \circ \varphi$. Here, $r_g(h) = hg$ is the right multiplication with $g \in G$ on G. As before, (U, x) is a chart of M and $(\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U), \varphi)$ is a fibre bundle chart of P, respectively. Again, it is possible to achieve that $V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is convex. Altogether, this leads to the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P \arrow[loop above, "\mathsf{r}_g"] \arrow[d, "\mathsf{p}"'] & \mathsf{p}^{-1}(U) \arrow[l, hook', "\iota"'] \arrow[loop above, "\mathsf{r}_g"] \arrow[r, "\varphi"] \arrow[d, "\mathsf{p}"'] & U \times G \arrow[loop above, "\mathsf{id}_U \times r_g"] \arrow[r, "x \times \mathsf{id}_G"] \arrow[d, "\mathsf{pr}_1"'] & V \times G \arrow[loop above, "\mathsf{id}_V \times r_g"] \arrow[d, "\mathsf{pr}_1"'] \\
M & U \arrow[l, hook', "\iota"'] \arrow[r, equal] & U \arrow[r, "x"] & V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.3}$$

Again, every column of this diagram describes a principal fibre bundle with the same structure group G. Similar to Lemma 4.5 the following statement holds.

Lemma 5.1 *The restriction map, the fibre bundle chart and the chart of M give rise to chain maps*

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)^G) \arrow[d] & \\ \mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(U, \mathrm{DiffOp}(\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U))^G) \arrow[r, "\cong"] & \mathrm{HC}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)^G). \end{tikzcd} \tag{5.4}$$

The computation of the Hochschild cohomologies $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet_{\mathrm{diff}}(V, \mathrm{DiffOp}(V \times G)^G)$, now with the restriction to the G-invariant differential operators with respect to the action $\mathsf{id}_V \times r_g$ of the trivial principal fibre bundle, can be done in an absolutely analogous way to that for surjective submersions yielding the same result: in degrees $k \geq 1$ the cohomology is trivial. The reason for this are the following facts:

i.) $\mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)^G \subset \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)$ is a closed subspace for all $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and hence a topological Hausdorff and complete bimodule itself.

ii.) The differential operators $\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^1(V \times G)^G$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$ in (4.22) are G-invariant. Thus,

$$\delta_K^{-1} : \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_\bullet, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)^G) \longrightarrow \bigcup_{l=0}^{\infty} \mathsf{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(K_{\bullet-1}, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(V \times G)^G). \tag{5.5}$$

Altogether, we find the following theorem about the Hochschild cohomologies for principal fibre bundles.

Theorem 5.2 (Hochschild cohomology for principal fibre bundles) *Let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a principal fibre bundle with structure Lie group G. Then*

$$\mathrm{HH}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)^G) = \begin{cases} \mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)^G & \text{for } k = 0 \\ \{0\} & \text{for } k \geq 1. \end{cases} \tag{5.6}$$

Again, every $\phi \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(P)^G)$ with $L = (l_1, \dots, l_k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$, $k \geq 1$, and $\delta\phi = 0$ is of the form

$$\phi = \delta\Theta, \tag{5.7}$$

where $\Theta \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^{\tilde{L}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l+1}(P)^G)$ and $\tilde{L}$ as in (4.32).

Proof: The proof for $k = 0$ is again trivial. For $k \geq 1$ we choose an atlas $\{(U_\alpha, x_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in I}$ of M and an appropriate principal fibre bundle atlas $\{(\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U_\alpha), \varphi_\alpha)\}_{\alpha \in I}$ of P. Further, let $\{\chi_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$ be a partition of unity for M which is subordinate to the open cover $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$, so $\chi_\alpha \in C^\infty(M)$ with $\operatorname{supp} \chi_\alpha \subseteq U_\alpha$ and $\sum_{\alpha \in I} \chi_\alpha = 1$. Now, let $\phi \in \mathrm{HC}^k_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)^G)$ be closed, $\delta\phi = 0$. There exists an $l \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and a multi-index $L \in \mathbb{N}_0^k$ with $\phi \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(P)^G)$. The restrictions $\phi_{U_\alpha} \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^L(U_\alpha, \mathrm{DiffOp}^l(\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U_\alpha))^G)$ are closed, too. For them we find $\Theta_\alpha \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^{\tilde{L}}(U_\alpha, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l+1}(\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U_\alpha))^G)$, $\tilde{L} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{k-1}$ as in (4.32), with $\delta\Theta_\alpha = \phi_{U_\alpha}$. The restrictions

$$\Theta_{\chi_\alpha}(a_1, \dots, a_{k-1})|_{\mathsf{p}^{-1}(U_\alpha)} = \chi_\alpha|_{U_\alpha} \cdot \Theta_\alpha(a_1|_{U_\alpha}, \dots, a_{k-1}|_{U_\alpha})$$

and $\Theta_{\chi_\alpha}(a_1, \dots, a_{k-1})|_{P \setminus \mathsf{p}^{-1}(\operatorname{supp} \chi_\alpha)} = 0$ define global elements $\Theta_{\chi_\alpha} \in \mathrm{DiffOp}^{\tilde{L}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l+1}(P)^G)$ which are evidently G-invariant. As in the proof of Theorem 4.13 one shows that $\Theta = \sum_{\alpha \in I} \Theta_{\chi_\alpha} \in \mathrm{HC}^{k-1}_{\mathrm{diff}}(M, \mathrm{DiffOp}^{l+1}(P))$ has the correct degrees of differentiation and yields (5.7). ■

Corollary 5.3 *Every principal fibre bundle admits a deformation quantization which is unique up to equivalence.*

In order to prove the existence of a deformation quantization which in addition preserves the fibration, we proceed analogously to the general case, only taking care of the additional G-invariance. We have to choose an always existing G-invariant, torsion-free covariant derivative ∇^P respecting the vertical bundle. The additional requirement of G-invariance means that $\mathsf{r}_g^* \nabla^P_Z W = \nabla^P_{\mathsf{r}_g^* Z} \mathsf{r}_g^* W$ for all vector fields $V, W \in \Gamma^\infty(TP)$ and $g \in G$.

Lemma 5.4 *Let ∇^P be a G-invariant covariant derivative. Then the l-fold symmetrized covariant derivative is G-invariant for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\mathsf{r}_g^* \circ \mathsf{D}_P^{(l)} = \mathsf{D}_P^{(l)} \circ \mathsf{r}_g^*. \tag{5.8}$$

Lemma 5.5 *Let $\bullet$ be a deformation quantization of a principal fibre bundle $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ with structure Lie group G. Then there exists a formal series $T = \mathsf{id} + \sum_{r=1}^\infty \lambda^r T_r$ of G-invariant differential operators $T_r \in \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)^G$, such that*

$$T(\mathsf{p}^* a) = 1 \bullet a \quad \forall a \in C^\infty(M). \tag{5.9}$$

Proof: According to the proof of Lemma 4.16 the G-invariance of $\bullet$ yields $\mathsf{r}_g^* D_r(a) = D_r(a)$ and $T_s^r \in \Gamma^\infty(HP)^G$. The G-invariance of ∇^P finally proves the assertion. ■

Again, such a map T is an equivalence transformation and leads to the following corollary which concludes the proof of Theorem 1.6.

Corollary 5.6 *Every principal fibre bundle admits a deformation quantization which preserves the fibration.*

Since every principal fibre bundle is a surjective submersion, every deformation quantization $\bullet$ and every decomposition (4.42) lead to a bimodule structure (4.45). As we will see, there exists a geometrically motivated choice of the decomposition (4.42) such that the derived structures $\bullet'$ and $\star'$ are G-invariant with respect to the canonical left action of G on $\mathrm{DiffOp}(P)$ induced by r_g^*. Clearly, $\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)$ is an invariant subspace.

Lemma 5.7 *Let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a surjective submersion and let ∇^P be a torsion-free covariant derivative, which respects the vertical bundle. Then the symbol map*

$$\sigma : \mathrm{DiffOp}^\bullet(P) \longrightarrow \Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^\bullet TP) = \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^l TP), \tag{5.10}$$

with respect to ∇^P restricts to a vector space isomorphism

$$\sigma : \mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \longrightarrow \Gamma^\infty(S^\bullet VP) = \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\infty} \Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^l VP) \tag{5.11}$$

from the vertical differential operators to the vertical symmetric multi-vector fields. If in addition $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ is a principal fibre bundle and ∇^P is G-invariant, then σ is G-equivariant.

Proof: That (5.10) is an isomorphism is a general consequence of any symbol calculus, confer Remark 4.7. In the present situation we additionally choose a connection on P and consider the covariant derivative ∇^M of Lemma 4.15. With (4.38) and the Leibniz rule $\mathsf{D}_P^{(j)}(fh) = \sum_{s=0}^{j} \mathsf{D}_P^{(s)} f \vee \mathsf{D}_P^{(j-s)} h$ we find that the property $D(f \cdot \mathsf{p}^* a) = D(f) \cdot \mathsf{p}^* a$ of vertical differential operators $D = \sum_{j=0}^{l} D_{T_j} \in \mathrm{DiffOp_{ver}}^{l}(P)$ is equivalent to $T_j \in \Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^j VP)$ for all $j = 0, \ldots, l$. Due to Lemma 5.4, G-invariance of ∇^P finally leads to $\mathsf{r}_g^* \circ D_{T_j} = D_{(\mathsf{r}^g)^* T_j} \circ \mathsf{r}_g^*$ for all $g \in G$ and $j = 0, \ldots, l$. ∎

The choice of a principal connection, i.e. a G-invariant decomposition $TP = VP \oplus HP$ with $T\mathsf{r}_g HP = HP$, gives rise to a G-invariant decomposition

$$\Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^\bullet TP) = \Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^\bullet VP) \oplus \overline{\Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^\bullet VP)}, \tag{5.12}$$

where $\overline{\Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^\bullet VP)}$ is the complementary vector space of $\Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^\bullet VP)$ induced by $TP = VP \oplus HP$. Using the symbol map of Lemma 5.7 with respect to a G-invariant covariant derivative, $\overline{\mathrm{DiffOp_{ver}}(P)} = \sigma^{-1}(\overline{\Gamma^\infty(\mathrm{S}^\bullet VP)})$ is a vector space which leads to a particular decomposition (4.42)

$$\mathrm{DiffOp}(P) = \mathrm{DiffOp_{ver}}(P) \oplus \overline{\mathrm{DiffOp_{ver}}(P)}. \tag{5.13}$$

Due to G-equivariance of σ this decomposition is G-invariant, too. Obviously, (5.13) depends on the choices of the principal connection and the covariant derivative. Altogether, this leads to the final theorem of this section.

Theorem 5.8 *Let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a principal fibre bundle with structure Lie group G and let $\bullet$ be a deformation quantization with respect to a star product $\star$ on M. Then there exists a bimodule structure*

$$_{(\mathrm{DiffOp_{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]],\star')}(\bullet', C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]], \bullet)_{(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]],\star)} \tag{5.14}$$

as in (4.45) with the further property that $\star'$ and $\bullet'$ are G-invariant, i.e.

$$\mathsf{r}_g^*(A \star' B) = (\mathsf{r}_g^* A) \star' (\mathsf{r}_g^* B), \tag{5.15}$$

$$\mathsf{r}_g^*(A \bullet' f) = (\mathsf{r}_g^* A) \bullet' (\mathsf{r}_g^* f) \tag{5.16}$$

for all $A, B \in \mathrm{DiffOp_{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]]$, $f \in C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$ and $g \in G$. Moreover, $\star'$ is unique up to G-equivariant equivalence and the algebras in (5.14) are mutual commutants.

Proof: Regarding the recursive construction of $\rho' = \mathsf{id} + \sum_{r=1}^\infty \lambda^r \rho'_r$ from Proposition 2.4 an induction shows that ρ' is G-invariant: indeed, the G-invariance of $\bullet$ and $\mathsf{r}_g^*(\delta D(a)) = \delta(\mathsf{r}_g^* D)(a)$ for all $D \in \mathrm{DiffOp}(P)$ and $a \in C^\infty(M)$ show that for all $A \in \mathrm{DiffOp_{ver}}(P)$ and $r \geq 1$ the element $\mathsf{r}_g^* \rho'_r(A)$ satisfies the same defining equation as $\rho'_r(\mathsf{r}_g^* A)$. With the G-invariance of the decomposition (5.13) these elements are equal by uniqueness. Thus we have the G-invariance of ρ' and (5.16) follows directly. By definition, this implies (5.15). The uniqueness of $\star'$ up to G-equivariant equivalence is also clear as $\bullet'$ establishes a G-equivariant isomorphism to the commutant of $(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]], \star)$. ∎

Remark 5.9 From this point of view one can now understand the results of [32] in a more geometric way, independent of the concrete model of the noncommutative gauge theory: For two infinitesimal classical gauge transformations $\xi, \eta \in \mathfrak{gau}(P) = \Gamma^\infty(VP) \subseteq \mathrm{DiffOp}^1_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)$ the deformed action gives

$$\xi \bullet' (\eta \bullet' f) - \eta \bullet' (\xi \bullet' f) = (\xi \star' \eta - \eta \star' \xi) \bullet' f = \mathscr{L}_{[\xi,\eta]} f + \cdots, \tag{5.17}$$

where in general the higher order contributions are *nontrivial*. The Lie algebra of infinitesimal gauge transformations $\mathfrak{gau}(P)$ is in general no longer a Lie subalgebra of $(\mathrm{DiffOp_{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]], \star')$ with respect to the $\star'$-commutator. This was observed in [32] on the level of associated vector bundles for particular situations.

6 Associated Vector Bundles

The construction of associated vector bundles is one of the most important features of principal fibre bundles. The present section shows that our Definition 1.4 of a deformation quantization of principal fibre bundles naturally leads to a deformation quantization of associated vector bundles.

Deformation quantization of vector bundles $\mathsf{p} : E \longrightarrow M$ is already established and can be put down to deformation quantization of finitely generated projective modules, since the sections $\Gamma^\infty(E)$ are such a right module over $C^\infty(M)$. The well-known definitions and results can all be found in [13] and [43]. Altogether, one considers the deformed bimodule

$$ {}_{(\Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(E))[[\lambda]],\star'_E)}(\bullet'_E, \Gamma^\infty(E)[[\lambda]], \bullet)_{(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]],\star)}, \tag{6.1} $$

where the right module structure itself is defined as a deformation quantization of the vector bundle E. It is known, confer [43], Thm. 1, that for a given star product $\star$ the deformed bimodule structures $\bullet'_E$, $\bullet$ and the algebra structure $\star'_E$ are unique up to equivalence and that the two deformed algebras $(\Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(E))[[\lambda]], \star'_E)$ and $(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]], \star)$ are mutual commutants.

In the following we use some basic facts about the geometry of associated vector bundles which for example can be found in detail in [37]. Let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a principal fibre bundle with structure Lie group G. The associated vector bundle with respect to a representation $\pi : G \longrightarrow \mathsf{End}(V)$ of G on a finite dimensional vector space V over $\mathbb{C}$ from the left is denoted by $P \times_G V$. All results of this section are based on the well-known isomorphism

$$ \Gamma^\infty(P \times_G V) \cong (C^\infty(P) \otimes V)^G \tag{6.2} $$

between the smooth sections of the associated bundle and the G-invariant V-valued functions on P with respect to the left action $\mathsf{r}_g^* \otimes \pi(g)$ on $C^\infty(P) \otimes V$. Together with the according left action on the algebra $\mathrm{DiffOp}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V)$ one finds the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1 *The G-invariant bimodule structure*

$$ {}_{(\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)[[\lambda]],\star')}(\bullet', C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]], \bullet)_{(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]],\star)} \tag{6.3} $$

of Theorem 5.8 yields a bimodule structure

$$ {}_{((\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)\otimes\mathsf{End}(V))^G[[\lambda]],\star')}(\bullet', (C^\infty(P) \otimes V)^G[[\lambda]], \bullet)_{(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]],\star)}. \tag{6.4} $$

Proof: With the obvious new structures the G-invariance of $\star'$, $\bullet'$ and $\bullet$ ensures that the considered G-invariant elements form a sub-algebra and a sub-bimodule. ■

Using the isomorphism (6.2), the right module structure of (6.4) directly leads to a deformation quantization of the associated vector bundle.

Theorem 6.2 (Deformation quantization of associated vector bundles) *Let $\bullet$ be a deformation quantization of a principal fibre bundle. Then, by* (6.4)*, every associated vector bundle inherits a deformation quantization in the sense of [13].*

Since (6.4) is a bimodule structure, the algebra $((\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)\otimes\mathsf{End}(V))^G[[\lambda]], \star')$ can be related to the commutant of the deformed vector bundle. To this end we first recall that $P \times_G \mathsf{End}(V) \cong \mathsf{End}(P \times_G V)$, where $\mathsf{End}(P \times_G V)$ is the bundle of endomorphisms of $P \times_G V$. One gets

$$ (C^\infty(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G \cong \Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(P \times_G V)) \tag{6.5} $$

and with (6.2) the action of $f \otimes L \in (C^\infty(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G$ on $h \otimes w \in (C^\infty(P) \otimes V)^G$ is given by $(f \otimes L)(h \otimes w) = fh \otimes L(w)$. In analogy to that one defines the map

$$\psi : (\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G \longrightarrow \Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(P \times_G V)) \tag{6.6}$$

via $(A \otimes L)(h \otimes w) = A(h) \otimes L(w)$. By (6.5) ψ is surjective. Altogether we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(C^\infty(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G \arrow[d, hook] \arrow[dr, "\cong"] & \\
(\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G \arrow[r, "\psi"] & \Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(P \times_G V)).
\end{tikzcd} \tag{6.7}$$

With these arrangements we can investigate the commutant of the deformed associated vector bundle. By (6.4), for every element $D \in (\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G[[\lambda]]$ there exists a unique element $\phi(D) \in \mathsf{End}_{C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]}(\Gamma^\infty(P \times_G V)[[\lambda]], \bullet)$ in the commutant with $D \bullet' s = \phi(D)s$ for all $s \in \Gamma^\infty(P \times_G V)[[\lambda]]$.

Lemma 6.3 *The map*

$$\phi : (\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G[[\lambda]] \longrightarrow \mathsf{End}_{C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]}(\Gamma^\infty(P \times_G V)[[\lambda]], \bullet) \tag{6.8}$$

is surjective.

Proof: Let $K = \sum_{r=0}^\infty \lambda^r K_r \in \mathsf{End}_{C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]}(\Gamma^\infty(P \times_G V)[[\lambda]], \bullet)$. By definition, it is clear that $K_0 \in \Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(P \times_G V))$. With (6.6) there exists an element $D_0 \in (\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G$ with $K_0 = \psi(D_0)$. With $\phi(D_0) = \sum_{r=0}^\infty \lambda^r \phi(D_0)_r$ it follows that $\psi(D_0) = \phi(D_0)_0$. Thus, the element $K - \phi(D_0) = \sum_{r=1}^\infty \lambda^r K_r^{(1)}$ of the commutant begins in order λ. Due to the $\mathbb{C}[[\lambda]]$-linearity of ϕ, iteration proves the lemma. ■

By the results of [43], the commutant $\mathsf{End}_{C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]]}(\Gamma^\infty(P \times_G V)[[\lambda]], \bullet)$ is isomorphic to $\Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(P \times_G V))[[\lambda]]$ and we immediately get the following theorem.

Theorem 6.4 *Let $\bullet$ denote a deformation quantization of a principal fibre bundle as well as the induced deformation quantization of an associated vector bundle $E = P \times_G V$. Then, for all structures $\star'_E$ and $\bullet'_E$ as in (6.1) there exists a surjective algebra homomorphism*

$$\phi : ((\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G[[\lambda]], \star') \longrightarrow (\Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(E))[[\lambda]], \star'_E) \tag{6.9}$$

such that

$$D \bullet' s = \phi(D) \bullet'_E s \tag{6.10}$$

for all $D \in (\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G[[\lambda]]$ and $s \in \Gamma^\infty(E)[[\lambda]]$.

We conclude this section with a few remarks on aspects concerning Morita theory. It is well known that classically $\Gamma^\infty(E)$ provides a Morita equivalence bimodule between the algebras $C^\infty(M)$ and $\Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(E))$, provided E has non-zero fibres. The corresponding deformed bimodule (6.1) is still a Morita equivalence bimodule, see the discussions in [12,13,15], where also a *strong* version of Morita equivalence including the *-algebra aspects is discussed.

From this point of view, Theorem 6.4 says that all the Morita equivalent algebras of the form $(\Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(E))[[\lambda]], \star'_E)$ are obtained from $(\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G[[\lambda]], \star')$. Motivated by the diagram (6.7), one can now ask the following question: Is $(C^\infty(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G$ deformed into a *subalgebra* of $(\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P) \otimes \mathsf{End}(V))^G[[\lambda]], \star')$ such that under the map ϕ it becomes isomorphic to $(\Gamma^\infty(\mathsf{End}(E))[[\lambda]], \star'_E)$? Classically, this is clearly the case, but for the deformed situation there are obstructions: we call the principal bundle P *sufficiently non-trivial* if there exists at least one non-trivial representation π of G on $\mathbb{C}$ such that the line bundle $L = P \times_G \mathbb{C}$ over M has non-trivial first Chern class $c_1(L) \in \mathrm{H}^2_{\mathrm{dR}}(M, \mathbb{C})$. Here we have to use the image of the topologically defined Chern class in the deRham cohomology, i.e. possible torsion effects may be lost.

Theorem 6.5 *Assume that the principal bundle P is sufficiently non-trivial and $\star$ is a symplectic star product. Then there exists no deformation $\star'_M$ of $C^\infty(M)$ with an algebra homomorphism*

$$\Phi : \big(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]], \star'_M\big) \longrightarrow \big(\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)^G[[\lambda]], \star'\big) \tag{6.11}$$

with $\Phi = \mathsf{p}^* + \sum_{r=1}^\infty \lambda^r \Phi_r$.

Proof: Assume that such a star product $\star'_M$ and a corresponding homomorphism Φ exist. Then $(C^\infty(M)[[\lambda]], \star'_M)$ would act from the left on the section $\Gamma^\infty(E)[[\lambda]]$ for any associated bundle according to Theorem 6.4. Moreover, this left module structure deforms the classical action as all the maps Φ and ϕ in zeroth order combine to the classical left multiplication of sections of E with functions. Applying this to the case of a line bundle L we know from [14], Thm. 1, that $\star'_M$ necessarily quantizes the same (symplectic) Poisson bracket and that the *relative class*, see [27], of $\star$ and $\star'_M$ is given by $t(\star'_M, \star) = 2\pi \mathrm{i} c_1(L)$. This has to be valid for *all* line bundles obtained from association. Thus if there exists a line bundle L with non-trivial first Chern class, the star products $\star'_M$ and $\star$ are in-equivalent. Conversely, one always has the trivial representation of G resulting in the trivial line bundle $L = M \times \mathbb{C}$, from which we conclude that the relative class vanishes, i.e. $\star'_M$ and $\star$ are equivalent. This is a contradiction. ∎

Example 6.6 Again, the Hopf fibration $S^3 \longrightarrow S^2$ provides an example for a sufficiently non-trivial principal bundle. The U(1)-representations $(\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\phi}, z) \mapsto \mathrm{e}^{n\mathrm{i}\phi} z$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ are all non-isomorphic and yield non-isomorphic line bundles L_n. In fact, $L_n = L_1^{\otimes n}$ for $n \geq 1$ and $L_{-1} = L_1^*$. The Chern classes are $c_1(L_n) = n c_1(L_1) \neq 0$ for $n \neq 0$.

This theorem can also be seen as a refined version of the obstruction for deforming p^* into an algebra homomorphism as discussed in the introduction. In fact, Theorem 6.5 gives an obstruction for a *bimodule* structure on $C^\infty(P)[[\lambda]]$ with respect to possibly two different star products $\star$ and $\star'_M$.

Corollary 6.7 *Let $\mathsf{p} : P \longrightarrow M$ be a sufficiently non-trivial principal bundle over a symplectic manifold M and let $\star$ be a symplectic star product on M. Then there exists no deformation of p^* into a G-invariant bimodule structure with respect to $\star$.*

Proof: Indeed, such a bimodule structure would first give a G-invariant right module structure which is unique up to equivalence. Then the left module structure gives an algebra homomorphism into the deformed vertical differential operators which is G-equivariant. Thus the image is in $(\mathrm{DiffOp}_{\mathrm{ver}}(P)^G[[\lambda]], \star')$ which is not possible by Theorem 6.5. ∎

References

[1] Abraham, R., Marsden, J. E.: *Foundations of Mechanics.* Addison Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, Mass., 2. edition, 1985.

[2] Bayen, F., Flato, M., Frønsdal, C., Lichnerowicz, A., Sternheimer, D.: *Deformation Theory and Quantization.* Ann. Phys. **111** (1978), 61–151.

[3] Bordemann, M.: *The deformation quantization of certain super-Poisson brackets and BRST cohomology.* In: Dito, G., Sternheimer, D. (eds.): *Conférence Moshé Flato 1999. Quantization, Deformations, and Symmetries*, *Mathematical Physics Studies* no. **22**, 45–68. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Boston, London, 2000.

[4] Bordemann, M.: *(Bi)Modules, morphismes et réduction des star-produits : le cas symplectique, feuilletages et obstructions.* Preprint **math.QA/0403334** (2004), 135 pages.

[5] Bordemann, M.: *(Bi)Modules, morphisms, and reduction of star-products: the symplectic case, foliations, and obstructions.* Trav. Math. **16** (2005), 9–40.

[6] Bordemann, M., Brischle, M., Emmrich, C., Waldmann, S.: *Phase Space Reduction for Star Products: An Explicit Construction for $\mathbb{C}P^n$.* Lett. Math. Phys. **36** (1996), 357–371.

[7] Bordemann, M., Brischle, M., Emmrich, C., Waldmann, S.: *Subalgebras with converging star products in deformation quantization: An algebraic construction for $\mathbb{C}P^n$.* J. Math. Phys. **37** (1996), 6311–6323.

[8] Bordemann, M., Ginot, G., Halbout, G., Herbig, H.-C., Waldmann, S.: *Formalité G_∞ adaptee et star-représentations sur des sous-variétés coïsotropes.* Preprint **math.QA/0504276** (2005), 56 pages. Extended version of the previous preprint math/0309321.

[9] Bordemann, M., Herbig, H.-C., Waldmann, S.: *BRST Cohomology and Phase Space Reduction in Deformation Quantization.* Commun. Math. Phys. **210** (2000), 107–144.

[10] Brzeziński, T., Majid, S.: *Quantum group gauge theory on quantum spaces.* Commun. Math. Phys. **157**.3 (1993), 591–638.

[11] Bursztyn, H.: *Poisson Vector Bundles, Contravariant Connections and Deformations.* In: Maeda, Y., Watamura, S. (eds.): *Noncommutative Geometry and String Theory.* [40], 26–37. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Noncommutative Geometry and String Theory.

[12] Bursztyn, H.: *Semiclassical geometry of quantum line bundles and Morita equivalence of star products.* Int. Math. Res. Not. **2002**.16 (2002), 821–846.

[13] Bursztyn, H., Waldmann, S.: *Deformation Quantization of Hermitian Vector Bundles.* Lett. Math. Phys. **53** (2000), 349–365.

[14] Bursztyn, H., Waldmann, S.: *The characteristic classes of Morita equivalent star products on symplectic manifolds.* Commun. Math. Phys. **228** (2002), 103–121.

[15] Bursztyn, H., Waldmann, S.: *Completely positive inner products and strong Morita equivalence.* Pacific J. Math. **222** (2005), 201–236.

[16] Cattaneo, A. S.: *On the Integration of Poisson Manifolds, Lie Algebroids, and Coisotropic Submanifolds.* Lett. Math. Phys. **67** (2004), 33–48.

[17] Cattaneo, A. S., Felder, G.: *Coisotropic Submanifolds in Poisson Geometry and Branes in the Poisson Sigma Model.* Lett. Math. Phys. **69** (2004), 157–175.

[18] Cattaneo, A. S., Felder, G.: *Relative formality theorem and quantisation of coisotropic submanifolds.* Preprint **math.QA/0501540** (2005), 31 pages.

[19] Cattaneo, A. S., Zambon, M.: *Pre-Poisson submanifolds.* Preprint **arXiv:0710.5772** (2007), 14 pages.

[20] Connes, A.: *Noncommutative Geometry.* Academic Press, San Diego, New York, London, 1994.

[21] Courant, T. J.: *Dirac Manifolds.* Trans. AMS **319**.2 (1990), 631–661.

[22] Dabrowski, L., Grosse, H., Hajac, P. M.: *Strong Connections and Chern-Connes Pairing in the Hopf-Galois Theory.* Commun. Math. Phys. **220** (2001), 301–331.

[23] Donald, J. D., Flanigan, F. J.: *Deformations of algebra modules.* J. Algebra **31** (1974), 245–256.

[24] Doplicher, S., Fredenhagen, K., Roberts, J. E.: *The Quantum Structure of Spacetime at the Planck Scale and Quantum Fields.* Commun. Math. Phys. **172** (1995), 187–220.

[25] Gerstenhaber, M.: *On the Deformation of Rings and Algebras.* Ann. Math. **79** (1964), 59–103.

[26] Glössner, P.: *Star Product Reduction for Coisotropic Submanifolds of Codimension 1.* Preprint Freiburg FR-THEP-98/10 **math.QA/9805049** (May 1998).

[27] Gutt, S., Rawnsley, J.: *Equivalence of star products on a symplectic manifold; an introduction to Deligne's Čech cohomology classes.* J. Geom. Phys. **29** (1999), 347–392.

[28] Hajac, P. M., Matthes, R., Szymański, W.: *Chern numbers for two families of noncommutative Hopf fibrations.* C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **336**.11 (2003), 925–930.

[29] Hawkins, E.: *Quantization of Equivariant Vector Bundles.* Commun. Math. Phys. **3** (1999), 517–546.

[30] Hawkins, E.: *Geometric Quantization of Vector Bundles and the Correspondence with Deformation Quantization.* Commun. Math. Phys. **215** (2000), 409–432.

[31] Herbig, H.-C.: *Variations on Homological Reduction.* PhD thesis, Fachbereich Mathematik der Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität Frankfurt, Frankfurt, 2006.

[32] Jurcŏ, B., Schraml, S., Schupp, P., Wess, J.: *Enveloping algebra-valued gauge transformations for non-abelian gauge groups on non-commutative spaces.* Eur. Phys. J. C Part. Fields **17**.3 (2000), 521–526.

[33] Jurčo, B., Schupp, P.: *Noncommutative Yang-Mills from equivalence of star products.* Eur. Phys. J. **C14** (2000), 367–370.

[34] Jurčo, B., Schupp, P., Wess, J.: *Noncommutative gauge theory for Poisson manifolds.* Nucl. Phys. **B584** (2000), 784–794.

[35] Jurčo, B., Schupp, P., Wess, J.: *Nonabelian noncommutative gauge theory via noncommutative extra dimensions.* Nucl.Phys. **B 604** (2001), 148–180.

[36] Jurčo, B., Schupp, P., Wess, J.: *Noncommutative Line Bundles and Morita Equivalence.* Lett. Math. Phys. **61** (2002), 171–186.

[37] Kolář, I., Michor, P. W., Slovák, J.: *Natural Operations in Differential Geometry.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1993.

[38] Kontsevich, M.: *Deformation Quantization of Poisson Manifolds, I.* Preprint **q-alg/9709040** (September 1997).

[39] Kontsevich, M.: *Deformation Quantization of Poisson manifolds.* Lett. Math. Phys. **66** (2003), 157–216.

[40] Maeda, Y., Watamura, S. (eds.): *Noncommutative Geometry and String Theory*, vol. 144 in *Prog. Theo. Phys. Suppl.* Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, 2001. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Noncommutative Geometry and String Theory.

[41] Waldmann, S.: *Deformation of Hermitian Vector Bundles and Non-Commutative Field Theory.* In: Maeda, Y., Watamura, S. (eds.): *Noncommutative Geometry and String Theory.* [40], 167–175. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Noncommutative Geometry and String Theory.

[42] Waldmann, S.: *On the representation theory of deformation quantization.* In: Halbout, G. (eds.): *Deformation quantization*, vol. 1 in *IRMA Lectures in Mathematics and Theoretical Physics*, 107–133. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 2002.

[43] Waldmann, S.: *Morita Equivalence, Picard Groupoids and Noncommutative Field Theories.* In: Carow-Watamura, U., Maeda, Y., Watamura, S. (eds.): *Quantum Field Theory and Noncommutative Geometry*, vol. 662 in *Lect. Notes Phys.*, 143–155. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005.

[44] Waldmann, S.: *Noncommutative field theories from a deformation point of view.* Preprint **arXiv:0710.2140** (October 2007), 19 pages. Contribution to the Proceedings of the Leipzig Conference “Recent Developments in Quantum Field Theory”.

[45] Waldmann, S.: *Poisson-Geometrie und Deformationsquantisierung. Eine Einführung.* Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, Berlin, New York, 2007.

[46] Weiss, S.: *Nichtkommutative Eichtheorien und Deformationsquantisierung von Hauptfaserbündeln.* Master thesis, Fakultät für Mathematik und Physik, Physikalisches Institut, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg, 2006. Available at `http://idefix.physik.uni-freiburg.de/~weiss/`.